

1402  
2433  
7007

# INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

BY  
AAGE BENTZEN  
*Hon. Dr. Theol., Basel University*  
*Late Professor in*  
*the University of Copenhagen*

VOL. I  
THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT  
THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT  
THE FORMS OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE

SEVENTH EDITION

G. E. C. GAD PUBLISHER . COPENHAGEN 1967

FIRST EDITION 1948  
SECOND EDITION (REVISED WITH A SUPPLEMENT) 1952  
THIRD EDITION (REPRINT OF SECOND EDITION) 1957  
FOURTH EDITION (REPRINT OF SECOND EDITION) 1958  
FIFTH EDITION (REPRINT OF SECOND EDITION) 1959  
SIXTH EDITION (REPRINT OF SECOND EDITION) 1961  
SEVENTH EDITION (REPRINT OF SECOND EDITION) 1967

Theology Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT  
California

*Printed in Denmark*  
ATELIER ELEKTRA  
*Uforandret optryk 1967*



## PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

There is no need for an elaborate preface to this book, published in Danish in 1941. The reasons for the arrangement of the material, differing from the Danish original, are given on pp. 17ff. of the introductory chapter. The manuscript was finished in the early spring of 1947. Since then only a few notes could be added during the printing.

My first duty is to express my profound gratitude towards the Rev. Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., of Manchester. He has shown his interest in the book in many ways, and above all he has taken upon himself the burden of reading the whole manuscript to improve my English. And the great amount of corrections which he has suggested is proof of the great work this has been.

Special thanks I also owe my old teacher from the days immediately after the war 1914–1918, Professor Paul Kahle, for placing at my disposal the proofs of his book *The Cairo Geniza* (1947).\*) Without this friendly help I could not have been able to revise the chapters on the Canon and the Text of the Old Testament in a way satisfactory to myself. But I also use this opportunity to thank him and Mrs. Kahle for the friendly reception I got in the Oriental Seminary of the University of Giessen and for the hospitality with which I was treated in their house during my year in Germany 1921–1922.

Finally I want to express some thoughts which have often been in my mind during the last war when I published my Danish works. I am in great debt to the Bodleian Library, Oxford, for the many times I have had the privilege to spend a month or more working in its reading-rooms. Several of my books and articles I have begun or finished there with the help of its rich store of books. To me the aesthetic charm of the ancient university town has its centre there. It is not only the books, but also the imponderable which cannot be expressed in dry words, which has stimulated my work from 1922, when I first saw the towers of the town from the railway train window till the last, in 1946. To me, there is the centre of the England, where I have lived many happy days of work in peacetime, and for which many of us have prayed, in the summer of 1940, as for our own country. For all this, for which I have no adequate words, I am thankful.

Hellerup, Denmark, February 1948.

AAGE BENTZEN.

\*) The work of Professor Kahle is quoted throughout my book as «Schweich Lectures 1941», because I did not know the title of the book till after the beginning of the printing of my Introduction.

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

*Earlier than expected the first 1000 copies of this book have disappeared from the shelves of the publisher. I can only be glad and grateful that the book seems to have responded to a demand for a work of mainly informatory character. – On account of the costs of printing this new edition has been reproduced photographically. This process imposes certain limitations upon the editing work. Some long additions have been collected in an Appendix to Vol. II. But numerous minor corrections have been made to carry the work abreast of current discussion. The general character of the book has remained the same.*

*I thank colleagues in all the world for valuable suggestions in reviews and for a great number of offprints and books sent to me on different subjects. They have helped greatly to overcome the difficulties of the work.*

*Hellerup, March 1952.*

AAGE BENTZEN.

## ABBREVIATIONS

AO:	Der Alte Orient.
AOB:	Altorientalische Bilder zum AT, ed. by <i>Gressmann</i> (1927).
AOT:	Altorientalische Texte zum AT, ed. by <i>Gressmann</i> (1927).
AT:	Altes Testament.
BH:	Biblia Hebraica, ed. <i>Rud. Kittel</i> , 3rd ed. by <i>Alt, Eissfeldt and Kahle</i> (1937).
DLZ:	Deutsche Literaturzeitung.
GK:	<i>Gesenius</i> , Hebr. Grammatik, 27th ed. by <i>Kautzsch</i> (1902).
HBAT:	Handbuch zum AT, ed. by <i>Eissfeldt</i> .
<i>Kautzsch</i> :	Die Heilige Schrift des AT's . . . übersetzt v. <i>E. Kautzsch</i> , 4th ed. by <i>A. Bertholet</i> .
LXX:	The Septuagint.
NT:	The New Testament.
OLZ:	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.
OT:	The Old Testament.
JBL:	The Journal of Biblical Literature.
PJB:	Palästinajahrbuch.
RGG:	Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.
SAT:	Die Schriften des AT in Auswahl neu übersetzt . . . v. <i>Gunkel, Gressmann etc.</i>
SBOT:	The Sacred Books of the OT.
Strack-Billerbeck:	Kommentar z. NT. aus Talmud und Midrasch.
ThLZ:	Theologische Literaturzeitung.
ThStKr:	Theol. Studien und Kritiken.
ZATW:	Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft.
Beih. ZATW:	Beihefte zur ZATW.
ZNTW:	Zeitschr. f. d. neutestamentl. Wissenschaft.
ZDMG:	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
ZDPV:	Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästinavereins.
ZS:	Zeitschrift für Semitistik.
ZWTh:	Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie.

The current *handbooks* of Introduction to the OT are generally quoted only by the name of the author and page, *commentaries* as a rule only by name of author, referring tacitly to the place where the passage of the Bible in question is expounded. Quotations of *Rabbinical* literature are, when a word like *Jer.* (Jerusalemite), *Tosephta*, *Mishna* etc. is not added, from the Babylonian Talmud. – Besides the *translations of non Biblical texts* in AOT and *Barton*, Archaeology and the Bible, *Pritchard*, Near Eastern Texts (1950) should be consulted throughout the book.

# INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT:

## HISTORY, TASK AND METHOD

The word "*Introduction*", signifying a book which gives information concerning the Bible, was probably for the first time used, in Greek form, by a monk *Adrianus* (d. ca. 440 A. D.). From the Greek comes the term «*Isagogik*», often used by German scholars, translated into German in 1750 in the title to J. D. Michaelis' "*Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes*". The English expression "*Introduction*" is of course derived from the Latin translation of the original Greek word.

The first steps of an "*Introduction*" we have as soon as scholars begin to collect information to understand the Scriptures. *Eissfeldt* points out that a superscription like Ps. 18, 1 is an "*introductory note*" of this kind. Such information is given e. g. in the *Rabbinical* writings. Only it is not yet systematized.

A process of systematization, however, takes place during the end of Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Often it takes the form of *prefaces* to the different books, e. g. the famous prefaces of *Jerome*. The same form we meet in much later times, e. g. in the theological prefaces in *Luther's* translation. But the material can also be concentrated in *handbooks*, as the "*prooemiorum liber*" of *Isidore of Seville* (d. 636), giving details concerning the language of the books and *realia* such as geography, history and rules of interpretation: It is above all *hermeneutics* which have the interest of authors like *St. Augustine* (*De Doctrina Christiana*, esp. book II), *Cassiodorus* (d. ca. 585) and *Junilius Africanus* (ca. 550).

From the Middle Ages is especially remembered *Nicolaus de Lyra* (d. ca. 1340), famous for his knowledge of Hebrew which enabled him as one of very few mediaeval scholars to make use of the interpretations given by the independently working Jewish scholars such as *Rashi* (d. 1105, and *Ibn Ezra* (d. 1167).<sup>1)</sup>

With the rise of *humanistic learning* and the *reformation* at the end of the

<sup>1)</sup> The study of the OT in the Middle Ages has recently been treated by Miss B. Smalley in an interesting book entitled *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (1941); cf. *The Interpretation of the Bible* (Edward Alleyn Lectures, ed. by C. W. Dugmore, 1944). – See the *Appendix*.



Middle Ages the study of the Bible in the original languages gets its epoch-making renaissance. In questions concerning "Introduction" we meet with the beginnings of historical criticism — e.g. in *Luther's* remarks against the canonicity of the Book of Esther and presumptions of later redaction of certain Prophetic books; and by *Karlstadt* (*De canonicis Scripturis Libellus*, 1520) who has observations of importance for Pentateuchal criticism. My countryman, the first bishop of Roskilde after the reformation, *Petrus Palladius*, published in 1557 an "Isagoge" to the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures, mainly of dogmatic interest and giving a synopsis of the contents of the Bible.<sup>1)</sup> But the main stream of theological literature does not proceed very much from the reproduction of the ancient and mediaeval tradition. The rigid Protestant *dogma of inspiration*, which (e. g. by the *Buxtorfs* in the 17th century) went so far that even the vowel-points in the Hebrew text were considered a work of the Holy Spirit, prevented a really critical examination of the traditional material.

The controversy between the Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians, however, had the important consequence, that both parties were led to a discussion of the state of the Hebrew text, which by some (e.g. the Catholic *Morinus*, *Exercitationes biblicae de hebraei graecique textus sinceritate*, 1633; the Reformed *Capellus*, *Arcanum punctuationis revelatum*, 1624; *Critica sacra*, 1650 (on the consonant-text)) was considered less valuable than the LXX and the Vulgate. *Thomas Hobbes* (in *Leviathan* III, 33) enunciated for the treatment of the books the principle that the time of their origin must be determined by means of the books themselves, independently of tradition: This led him to deny the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch and to date many books from later times. *Spinoza*, the Jewish philosopher, in his *Tractatus theologico-politicus* from 1670 makes an ingenious effort, but without much effect in his own time. Here we find the subjects treated, which especially later on are considered the field of work for the science of Old Testament Introduction: 1) The origins of the different books, 2) the history of the Canon, and 3) the history of the text. *Spinoza* works quite independently of the tradition concerning the authors of the books. — Another representative of beginnings of criticism is the Catholic *Richard Simon* who in 1678 published his *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*. The main points of his investigations are the history of the text and of its interpretation. He differs from *Cappellus* by also finding errors in the Vulgate. He also has some incipient criticism concerning the author of the Pentateuch. Being a Roman Catholic he is very polemic against the inspiration theory of the Protestants, but it did not help him. When the publishing-firm before the

<sup>1)</sup> *Rordam*, *Kjøbenhavns Universitets Historie* I, p. 254. — cf. *Appendix*.

publication of the book sent out an advertisement with a table of contents, the book was confiscated. But a few copies were saved and used as foundation for a reprint in Holland, and in 1685 Simon himself published a good edition. He forced his antagonists to give a scientific answer to his theories, which by and by led to new investigations. His Protestant opponent, the Arminian *Clericus* (*Sentimens de quelques theologiens sur l'histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, 1685), acknowledged, e. g., that a problem of literary history had been brought up. He therefore in *Ars critica* (1697) accepted the implications of this and treated the textual criticism of the Biblical writings on the basis of common philological rules of profane science — a decisive apostasy from the dogma of verbal and literary inspiration.

It is the great merit of "rationalism", of the late 18th. century, to have made Biblical criticism scientific, unlimited by preconceived, in reality quite irreligious, theories of inspiration. In spite of its defect in real religious understanding — one of the few who in that age looked deeper into the OT, was *Herder* — it has caused progress which theology cannot give up without losing its own soul.

The principal works are *Semler's* *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon* (1771–75) and *Apparatus ad liberalem Veteris Testamenti interpretationem* (1773); *Herder's* *Älteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts* (1774–76), *Salomons Lieder der Liebe* (1778), *Briefe, das Studium der Theologie betreffend* (1780), *Vom Geist der ebräischen Poesie* (1782); and in England *Lowth's* *De sacra Poësi Hebraeorum* (1753), the latter — as the date shows — by far the first work and of great importance. *Lowth* and *Herder* supplement *Semler's* and the other German critical investigations by stressing the aesthetic and religious value of the Biblical writings.

The founder of modern isagogic science is *J. G. Eichhorn*, who in 1780–83 published his *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (3 vols., from the 4th. ed. (1823) in 5 vols). Here as in *Spinoza's* works we find treated the three main subjects which are still the most important for the OT introductory work: The origin of the Canon, the history of the text, and the origins of the different books. This field of investigation is now separated from other branches of knowledge, which before this time also had their place in *theologia introductoria*: questions of language, geography, history, archaeology, religion (theology) and above all hermeneutics. In the course of the 19th century the part dealing with the origins of the single books (the "special introduction" as different from the "general introduction", the subjects of which were the history of the Canon and the textual history) took more and more attention. Here most work had to be done.



Free from "rationalism", in the spirit of *Herder* and *Schleiermacher*, *De Wette* in the beginning of the 19th century writes his books, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1806–07) and an *Introduction* (1817) which saw 8 new editions (7th by *Stähelin*, 1852; 8th by *Schrader*, 1869). His point is, that the writings show the evolution of OT religious ideas, a point of view which can be used for the dating of the books. From the *Hegelian* school comes *Vatke's* *Die biblische Theologie I* (1835). Only the first volume of this work of history of religion has appeared. It gives indirectly an *Introduction* and had great influence on *Wellhausen* who took over its evolutionism, but not its Hegelianism. The *Introduction* proper of *Vatke* was edited posthumously in 1886. It moves on more traditional lines. The *methods* of introductory science were treated by *Hupfeld* in his *Ueber Begriff und Methode der sogenannten biblischen Einleitung* (1844). He thus defines the scope of the work: to find out what were the writings originally, and how have they become what they are. He therefore proposes to call the branch of knowledge in question *The History of the Holy Scriptures*.

Other representatives of the critical line are *Gesenius*, *Olshausen*, *Knobel*, who are still connected with rationalism, while *Hupfeld* and the much studied *Bleek* exhibit more understanding of the revelation in the OT. The "Einleitung" of *Bleek* appeared in 1860. Later editions were published first by *Kamphausen* and then 4th to 6th editions (incl.) by *Wellhausen*. Many contributions to the science of *Introduction* were of course given by the illustrious orientalist *Ewald*.

But besides the critical line which we have hitherto sketched we find in the first half and still in the last fourth of the century a line, representing the *revival* of ecclesiastical Christianity in the beginning of the 19th century. This line reacted strongly against the religious limitations of "rationalism", and would therefore also throw overboard its scientific criticism, and *return to tradition*. Its leading men are *Hengstenberg*, *Hävernick*, *Keil*, and – with more understanding for the rights of criticism – *Franz Delitzsch* in Germany. In England the same tendency is represented by the famous Oxford Movement leader *Pusey*, whose scientific illiberality is not second to *Hengstenberg's* (see e. g. Dean *Stanley's* protest against his work on *Daniel the Prophet*). They were all of them men of great learning, and they used their learning with great energy to uphold the traditional conceptions. But the result of their work has demonstrated the impossibility of the task.

From the seventies the situation is dominated by *Wellhausen* and the Dutch scholar *Kuenen* together with *Pusey's* successor as Regius Professor of Hebrew in Oxford, the eminent noble scholar *S.R.Driver*. The *Introduction* of *Driver* from 1891 has seen 9 revised editions and several reprints and enjoyed inter-

national reputation. The Scotsman *Robertson Smith* too had great influence through his *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (1881, 2nd. ed. 1892 and several reprints). *Kuenen's* great work is from 1860-65 (a German edition was published in 1887-94 after the 2nd Dutch from 1885-93, but was not finished). The most influential book from this time, however, is no regular Introduction, but *Wellhausen's* brilliant and methodical *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (originally vol. I of this *Geschichte Israels* (1878)). *Wellhausen* forced people to make up their minds by his methodical and lucid representation of the critical results.

But from this period until our days a great many "Introductions" have been written in many languages. The whole world is working together now. Even Roman Catholic theology, which from the beginning of the 20th century is so severely tied up through the institution of the Papal Bible Commission, is sharing in the discussion. The encyclicas of Pius XII have greatly stimulated the work.

But it is evident that about the beginning of the new century some new features begin to appear in the treatment of the subject. The change will for all time be connected with the name of *Hermann Gunkel*.

We have said that the Introductions of the 19th century were mainly interested in the investigations into the state and origin of the books (cf. the programmatic words of *Hupfeld*, quoted p. 12). Characteristic works like those of *Kuenen* and *Driver* are mostly concerned with minute philological enquiries, especially in the field of literary criticism, i. e. with analysis; not only in the Pentateuch and the historical books, but also in the acute attempts to distinguish between original and secondary material in the books of the Prophets and the poetical writings. The *separation of sources* is sometimes driven to a caricature, as in *Ecclesiastes* or *Job*. The British pun: "Is the Pentateuch Mosaic or a Mosaic?" is not only characteristic for the sentiment among the opponents of literary criticism, but also among the younger generation of scholars as a whole. The Introductions generally contain a large "special introduction" with the critical examinations of the books, and a much shorter "general introduction", treating the history of the Canon and the text. In this connection it is remarkable that in this period Danish theology, in spite of the extensive works of *Buhl*, has not seen any treatment of the "special introduction". *Buhl* has, however, written on the subjects of the "General Introduction" (*Den gammeltestamentlige Skriftoverlevering* (1885; in German translation 1891: *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments*)). Also in *Sweden* the history of the Canon aroused interest in this period (books by *Stave* and later *Lindblom*). Of the works which are characteristic of the period only a few, like that of *Robertson Smith*, start



with the treatment of the history of the Canon, while the analysis of the different books here only touches some main problems.

The programme of Gunkel is outlined in his *Die altisraelitische Literatur in Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, edited by *Hinneberg*, part I, section VII, pp. 51-102 (1st ed. 1906, 2nd 1925).

There are also other programmatic writings from his hand, e.g. the short *Die Grundprobleme der israelitischen Literaturgeschichte* in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1906, cols. 1797-1800, reprinted in *Reden und Aufsätze* (1913), pp. 29-38. Here he also mentions his article *Bibelwissenschaft I, C: Literaturgeschichte Israels* in *RGG*, 1st ed.; 2nd ed.: *Literaturgeschichte, biblische* in vol. III cols. 1677-80. He has written no greater work than these articles on the isagogic problems as a whole. But besides minor special investigations and reviews he has shown his principles in practice in the two great commentaries to Genesis (1st ed. 1901, 3rd 1910 and later reprints) and *Die Psalmen* (1926), with an elaborate Introduction, completed by *Begrich* (1933). In 2nd ed. of the *RGG* the articles on the Biblical books demonstrate the dominating influence of Gunkel on the modern view of the OT. If we should mention a greater work, which carries out the programme of Gunkel, it must be the lavishly illustrated, but very heavy *Die althebräische Literatur* by *Hempel*, which began to appear in 1930 as a part of the *Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft* ed. by *Walzel*, and was completed in 1934, and the Swedish work by *Gunnar Hyblmö*, *Gamla testamentets literaturhistoria* (Lund 1938).

Gunkel was not the first to speak of "history of OT literature". Influenced by the programme of *Hupfeld* (see p. 12) the introductions have sometimes been arranged so that the special part did not deal with the books in the canonical order, but used a chronological disposition. Often it was necessary to drop the description of the books and to presuppose or to insert the analysis of the sources into the chronological scheme, so that the Biblical books were dissolved into their original constituent parts. This is done e. g. in *Reuss*, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments* (1881, 2nd ed. 1890) and in *Karl Budde*, *Geschichte der althebräischen Literatur* (1906, 2nd ed. 1909), and partly in *Wildeboer*, *Die Literatur des Alten Testaments* (German translation 1905 from the original Dutch of 1895<sup>1</sup>). This form, however, is the last consequence of the dominating analytical tendency; but it can never be satisfactory, because the results of the analysis always must be of a very hypothetical character.

Gunkel's programme is: Not analytical-critical "Introduction", but synthetic-creative "literary history"<sup>2</sup>). He asserts, that, being nearly completely ignorant concerning the date and authorship of practically all OT pieces of literature, a chronological history of Israelitic literature is impossible. On the other hand, in the earlier periods the *typical* and the *conventional* is more significant in the literature of Israel, than the individual and personal. Literature works by means of quite definite "types" or "categories" (*Gattungen*), which

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Elisfeldt*, p. 4.

it is our task to describe and if possible to follow through the development of history. *The history of Literature becomes the history of the forms of literature.*

In this connection it must be noted that *Gunkel* is also a leader in the so called "religionsgeschichtliche Schule", which takes great interest in the culture of Israel's neighbours. It is one of the results of a century of study of ancient Oriental peoples which was made possible after the deciphering of the hieroglyphs and the cuneiform script in the beginning of the 19th century. In the history of literature *Gunkel* wants the parallel phenomena of the neighbours to be duly respected and used to illuminate the Hebrew material. In many cases the "categories" can be more fully studied in the light of Egyptian and Mesopotamian material, where the "place in life" ("der Sitz im Leben") of the different "types" can be studied with more effect, because here we have direct evidence of their practical use, above all in the cultus of the temples.

This programme, however, does not mean that *Gunkel* wants to drop the old "Introduction" completely. He expressly asserts that the history of literature, to which he directs attention, presupposes the general solution of the problems of the old "Introduction". But on the other hand he hopes that the examination of types (the "Gattungsforschung") will react upon the "Introduction"<sup>1</sup>). He thinks that it will lead scholars instead of busying themselves with trifles to consider greater problems, and put many things in a new light: "The man who has seen, e. g., how the categories originate, that they are not merely created by single ingenious persons, but are developed through the cooperation of many generations, will not easily approve of the opinion that a single man such as Jeremiah should be able to create the poetry of the Psalms. Further, we shall more than before take into consideration oral tradition. We shall be more cautious in assuming literary dependence etc."

*Gunkel's* influence has been enormous. But he has not been able to make the "Introductions" superfluous. That his method has led to greater work on more significant problems, is doubtful, too. He has given rise to a *supplement* to the old "Introduction", but his work has not superseded it. Besides criticism of sources, the philological analysis, we have now got *criticism of style and of material*, and in connection with this the attempts to determine the "place in life" of the categories, their functioning in private and public, profane and religious life.

This has been of great importance for our research. Let us think e. g. of the change it has effected in the understanding of the Psalms or the legends of Genesis. But *Eissfeldt*<sup>2</sup>) rightly points out, that *Gunkel's* views and his representation of the material can only be applied to the small literary units: – the simple narrative, poem, or sentence – but seems to fail *vis à vis* the units of

<sup>1</sup>) v. Reden und Aufsätze, p. 37f.

<sup>2</sup>) p. 5.



medium or large size and especially over against the complete Biblical books. *Gunkel's* sketch has been of great importance for the smallest literary units. But it has taught us nothing new about composition and origin of the books which we have now before us, especially such books, e. g. the historical, which are more than loose compilations of small unities. We have had penetrating and very often ingenious analyses of the style of poems and narratives, vast collections of folkloristic and literary parallels illuminating the material and the ideas found in it, so that the importance of the *history of tradition* is dawning upon us. We have learned much of the *use of the types* of literature, through which we get a more detailed picture of Israel and Judaism than we had before. But that *synthesis* has been more dominating we can hardly assert. Consequently, in later years, we see that the disciples of *Gunkel*, e. g. *Mowinkel*, return to the "*philological method*" (analyses of the composition of the prophetic books and the separation of the sources)<sup>1</sup>). *Eissfeldt* maintains that what makes *Gunkel's* work unsatisfactory is the inclination to look at the *typical* and place the *personal-individual* in the background. Of course this can be corrected, but besides we must have an *analysis of the books*, which is not limited to the smaller, but also comprises the greater unities. And this analysis is often so uncertain that we must go through a very penetrating investigation in order to get an impression of the complexity of the problems. Another reason for the unsatisfactory state of *Gunkel's* analysis is also given by *Eissfeldt*: It is not sufficient to look upon the OT merely as the remnants which have been saved of a much richer Israelitic-Jewish national literature. *The Old Testament is in itself a book*, and as such has its abiding importance. It is a fact which can be established without all kinds of "Werturteile" and with a quite neutral position towards the theological notion of a Canon: The OT is in Judaism as in Christianity "Holy Scripture". Therefore it is the task of the historian, not only to analyze its forms of literature, their history, origin: how international, folkloristic, poetical and theological material have left its mark upon them, and their function in cultic and daily life; but also to show *how the forms of literature are used artistically and in learned compilations*, and how quite intentionally the work of religious men and theologians collect and shape them, down to the time when "the Canon" excludes what is not considered divinely inspired and therefore of normative significance for faith and life.

<sup>1</sup>) See e.g. his work in the Norwegian translation of the OT by *Michelet*, *Mowinkel* and *Messel* (I, 1929; II, 1935; III, 1944); cf. also his review of *Johs. Pedersen*, *Israel III-IV* in *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 1937 and his concluding remarks in *The two sources of the predeuteronomic primeval history (JE) in Gen. 1-11* (1937). - His views concerning the relations between traditio-historical and literary criticism appear in his lucid book *Prophecy and Tradition* (1946).

So *Eissfeldt* comes to the following definition in accordance with titles of the works of *R. Simon* and *E. Reuss* (*Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments*): *The task of the science of Introduction is to present the history of the OT from its earliest origins to its complete finish*. To the programme of Gunkel he will do justice by treating the "types", the forms of literature, in a section which now comes in between the older three: Analysis of the books ("special introduction"), the history of Canon and the Text ("general introduction"). The new section he places at the beginning of his work as the "vorliterarische Stufe", the *pre-literary stage*, where the smaller literary units and their place in life are examined. After that he inserts another section, giving a review of what he calls "literary units of medium size". Here he examines greater units which are foundations of the present books, e. g. sources of the Pentateuch and smaller collections of laws. But this anticipates the following analysis of the single books and therefore, as far as I can see, is standing in a somewhat awkward place. If the programme of *Eissfeldt* should be followed consistently, it would be better to begin with the old literary critical analysis and carry it to its finish with an examination of the forms of literature. Then a synthetic retrospective examination could be of greater use and would lead more organically to an examination of the history of the whole book of Holy Scripture, the history of Canon and text. As conclusion would then come a section, relating what *Eissfeldt* calls the "*Wirkungsgeschichte des Alten Testaments*" — the story of the OT in the Church. In the arrangement of *Eissfeldt* it is also a little unsatisfactory to call the introductory section "the pre-literary stage". We must realize that the types, the categories of literature, are living long after the origin of literature proper. The types of poetry in the Song of Songs are living at the present day in Syria, and people wrote poems in the old style of Psalms far down into the Christian era. And further we must draw attention to *oral tradition* as an important stream parallel to the literary fixed books. It is the Swedish scholar *H. S. Nyberg* who has stressed this point of view<sup>1</sup>). It is the expression "preliterary" which can be misunderstood.<sup>2</sup>) The arrangement of the different parts of the Introduction is not of great importance.

<sup>1</sup>) *Studien zum Hoseabuche* (1935), p. 7f. *Irans forntida religioner* (1937), pp. 9–15. Cf. *H. Birkeland*, *Zum hebräischen Traditionswesen* (1938). This point of view is represented by *I. Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet, en traditionshistorisk inledning I* (1945), and in articles on special subjects, e. g. in *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*.

<sup>2</sup>) An arrangement like that of *Eissfeldt* is also found in *Weiser*, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1939). — Among recent Introductions it is necessary here to make mention of the imposing work of *Pfeiffer*, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York 1941), cf. the very extensive review by *Albright* in *JBL* (1942), pp. 111–126.



But another arrangement is perhaps still more practical: To treat the forms of literature in the General Introduction. The forms of literature and their problems affect the whole OT. This method is therefore adopted in the present edition, while the Danish edition was arranged on lines like those just mentioned.

From what has been said it follows that the Introduction to the Old Testament must be defined as an *historical science*. It has no *method* of its own besides the usual *philologico-historical* in the broadest sense of the word. We cannot talk of a special "theological method". The task of presenting the history of the OT, of its forms of literature, its several books, the formation of the Canon and the history of the canonical text, is a purely historical one, but identical with the *theological task*, its goal being to understand "*the human side*" of the document of Revelation. The importance of this is that we are bound to a theology, marked by the *notion of incarnation*, and that all *docetism* must be repelled. Furthermore, we reject the rationalistic vein of orthodoxy which made the position of the OT as document of Revelation dependent upon opinions concerning its origin, upon theories concerning authors and dates, – cf. the definition of *Keil*: Introduction is the comprehension of the historical investigations proving the use of the Church of the OT as Canon for the time of pre-Christian Revelation, and the right of the Church to this use of it.

The method of the Introduction is therefore the usual *historico-critical*, which means that it is critical towards its own instruments, too. Also towards every Jewish and Christian tradition, *inclusive of the New Testament*. The last point is important. It lies outside the task of Christ as Saviour to give us the answers to historical and other scientific questions. He has declared himself not to be all-knowing concerning certain religious questions (Mk. 13,33), how much less here, then! Tradition never by itself decides historical questions. But of course we must beware of the inclination of hyper-criticism to regard tradition with scepticism on principle.<sup>1)</sup>

At last we must touch upon the problem of *limitation of the Special Introduction*, the examination of the single books. Here the different extent of the Canon by Jews and Christians and in the different Christian confessions is of importance. Are we to deal with the Apocrypha or not?

On historical arguments it may be maintained that regarding the fact that the Canon originates through a process of selection among a greater bulk of books it is necessary to investigate the material which was not given access to

<sup>1)</sup> I refer to the clear methodical remarks in a Danish dissertation by *G. Hermansen*: Studien über den italischen und römischen Mars (1940), p. 11. – cf. also the discussion between *Edw. J. Young* and myself in The Evangelical Quarterly (1951), pp. 81–89.

the Canon, i. e. to examine the Apocrypha. It is also a practical consequence of the importance of these writings for the understanding of the New Testament. On the other hand the Introduction cannot start a discussion of the problem: Are the Apocrypha rightly or wrongly a part of the Canon? Our only task is to give an historical account of the motive which can be shown to be or presumed to be the causes which led the men of the Synagogue and the Church to pass the verdict which they gave on the writings. Most practical it will be, first to examine the writings in regard to which all confessions agree, viz. those comprised in the *Hebrew Canon*; and in the order which they occupy there. After that we may look at the Apocrypha.

The most important *literature* has been mentioned on the preceding pages. In addition the reader is referred to the contributions by *Hempel*, *Eissfeldt*, and others, to *Record and Revelation* (1938), ed. by *Wheeler Robinson*, and above all to the monumental work of *Pfeiffer*, mentioned above, p. 17, n. 2. *Weiser's* *Einleitung* appeared in a new edition in 1949 (I have not seen it; cf. Book List of the Soc. of OT Study 1950, p. 46). So did *Sellin's* in 1950, after the death of the author, under the auspices of *L. Rost* (cf. my review in *Vetus Testamentum* 1951, pp. 146f.). – Handy and concise books for beginners and general readers are *Vriezen*, *Oud-Israelitische Geschriften* (1948) (Dutch), *S. A. Cook*, *An Introduction to the Bible* (1945), and *Rowley*, *The Growth of the Old Testament* (1950), – *Protestant Fundamentalism* is represented by *An Introduction to the O.T.*, by *Edw. J. Young* (Grand Rapids 1949), and *A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch*, by *G. Ch. Aalders* (London 1949) – see *The Evangelical Quarterly* (1950), pp. 154ff.; on *Young's* book see also *Eissfeldt* in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1951, cols. 34–55. – On some recent *Roman Catholic* works, see *Ziegler*, in *Biblica* 1951, pp. 263–272. Special Introductions to the *Apocrypha* are given by *Oesterley*, *Torrey*, and *Pfeiffer*, (cf. II, p. 219). Valuable help to follow the progress of contemporary scholarship is – besides in the bibliographies of scientific journals – found in such books as the annual *Book List* of the *Society for Old Testament Study* (since 1946) and the books published under the auspices of the same society: *The People and the Book* (1925), *Record and Revelation* (1938) and *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (1951); cf. also *The Study of the Bible today and tomorrow* (1947) – by American Scholars. – The most comprehensive Introduction of recent years is the posthumous work of *A. Lods*, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive des origines à la ruine de l'État juif* (1950), cf. *Rowley* in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1950, pp. 110ff.

# THE CANON

## THE CANON OF PALESTINE

### *Canon and Apocrypha.*

The Greek word *Canon* originally denotes a “staff”, in Greek pre-Christian literature: a *standard*, a *rule*, or a *pattern*. As a name for a *collection of writings normative for faith and teaching* it first seems to appear in writings of *Athanasius* (4th century) with reference to the *New Testament*. It is in the *Latin Church* that the word with certainty can be said to have been used of a “rule” in this meaning. Before that time it is uncertain if the *Greek Church* would have it used of a normative collection of Scripture. The word can also mean “list”, “catalogue”. The conception of Canon as *normative Scripture* is in more ancient times described in the terms “*Holy Scripture*”, “*The Holy Scriptures*”, “*Scripture*”, “*The Scriptures*”, which in the NT is used of the OT (2 Tim. 3, 15; Mt. 21, 42, cf. *W. Bauer*, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des NT*, s. v. *ιερός, γράμμα, γραφή, βιβλος*). Similar formulas are used by *Philo* (*Vita Mosis* I, 23, II, 290 etc.), *Josephus* (*Ant.* XX, 216 etc.), and in Semitic forms in the *Mishnah* (*Shabbath* XVI, 1, *Yadaim* III, 5). But here we also meet the peculiar expression that the canonical Scriptures “*defile the hands*”.<sup>1)</sup> The tractate *Yadaim* treats the problem of the canonical writings in connection with rules of washing the hands after touching something “unclean”.

The expression *apocryphal*, used of writings, which so to say are applying for reception into the Canon, is a somewhat difficult word. The Greek word *apokryphos* means *concealed*, *secret*; but it can also signify *books that have not been written by the man whose name is associated with them as author*. This latter significance, however, is not very common. The word can also denote books which contain so deep matters that they are only intelligible to the initiated. Among the

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Tiele's Kompendium der Religionsgeschichte*, 4th ed. by *N. Söderblom* (1912), pp. 32ff. *Ankermann in Chantepie de la Saussaye*, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, 1925, I, p. 152. A good account of the Jewish discussion on the expression in *Moore*, *Judaism* III, p. 65.



Christians it means *writings which are excluded from the Canon*<sup>1</sup>). By Origen it is used as translation of the Hebrew *ganūz*, "concealed", which is generally believed to signify that a book is excluded from the Canon. Against this opinion, however, Moore<sup>2</sup>) has maintained that the Hebrew word has not got the modern significance of "apocryphal", excluded from the Canon, until late Rabbinic times where we have not "tradition, but ... exegetical invention". Originally the word meant that a book was *excluded from public use* (cf. below, p. 29f.). That it was *excluded from the Canon* is expressed by the ideas mentioned above: that the Scriptures "do not defile the hands", or that they have not been written through the Holy Spirit or the like. The modern use of the word "apocryphal" originates from Jerome (in the Prologus Galeatus: "inter Apocrypha esse ponendum"), and from the distinction made by Luther who gave them the superscription: "Books which cannot be reckoned as equal with the canonical books of the Holy Scripture, but nevertheless are good and useful to read."

From the Apocrypha modern usage distinguishes the *Pseudepigrapha*. The word ought to denote books written under a fictitious name, but *practically* it at least partly signifies books which for a time have been accepted in the Canon in some of the Churches, but are generally rejected by the LXX and the Vulgate<sup>3</sup>). The name is not very appropriate, for not all these writings are pseudonymous, but partly anonymous, and on the other hand pseudonymous books are found both among the canonical (Dan., Prov., Cant., Eccles.) and among the apocryphal writings (Bar., Epist. Jer., Wisd.). And some editions include books never accepted by Synagogue and Church<sup>4</sup>).

*Literature:* cf. II, p. 219. Buhl, (Copenhagen 1885), German ed.: *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments* (1891), English ed. (1892). W. Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (2nd ed. 1892). E. Stave, *Om uppkomsten af Gamla Testamentets Kanon* (1894). G. Hölscher, *Kanonisch und Apokryph* (1905). Lindblom, *Kanon och apokryfer, Studier till den bibliska kanons historia* (1919). Moore, *Judaism* (cf. above). *Mensching*, *Das heilige Wort* (1937), pp. 71–89. Bertholet, *Die Macht der Schrift* (Abh. d. Berl. Akad. 1948). G. Östborn, *Cult and Canon* (1950).—For *Roman Catholic terms*, see p. 41.

### *Prehistory of the Canon.*

From time immemorial people have believed that gods spoke through human words. But not until rather late in the history of Israel books are used as "Holy

<sup>1</sup>) See Torm, *Indledning til det Nye Testamente* (Copenhagen 1940), p. 464f., cf. pp. 460ff. concerning other expressions in the works of the Greek Fathers.

<sup>2</sup>) op. cit. I, p. 247, cf. III, pp. 70ff.; cf. Torrey, *The Apocryphal Literature* (1948), pp. 7ff.

<sup>3</sup>) The translation of Charles e.g. includes the Fragments of a Zadokite Work and the "Sayings of the Fathers" from the Mishnah.

<sup>4</sup>) *Steuernagel*, *Einleitung*, p. 799.—On Torrey's view, cf. below, p. 41, and II, pp. 218 and 236.



Scripture". In the Jewish Church "The Law of Moses" is binding obligation. How early this word is used of "the Five Books of Moses" is uncertain. This will be examined in greater detail in part II. As the Law was not finished in its present shape until ca. 400 B. C., it cannot be assumed that the usage is older than this time. But it seems to be used in some places in Chron. and later writings (see II).

Often *Neh. 8-10* is understood as an account of the promulgation of the Law. This idea has been criticized by *Mowinkel*<sup>1)</sup> who tried to prove that this chapter does not describe the promulgation of a new law, but only the introduction of a new feature in the Feast of Tabernacles. The reading of the Law is only a usual ritual reading at the New Year Festival. This rite had developed during the Exile and was now the most important part of the cult. When it is said that the people were moved to tears this is not because they have met something new, a new ideal, but the pious emotion which would shake every Jew hearing the words of the Law spoken by such a holy man as Ezra<sup>2)</sup>. Against this theory, however, several arguments can be advanced. The pulpit and perhaps the weeping<sup>3)</sup> may show that something extraordinary is going on. *Johs. Pedersen*<sup>4)</sup> has pointed out that a religious reformer in the Orient behaves just as Ezra does, and we do not know that a regular reading of the Law took place at the New Year Festival in Ezra's times. When *Mowinkel* denies the usual opinion concerning Ezra 8, he gives Ezra too little significance compared with the importance with which the firman of Artaxerxes seems to invest him. Therefore it is better to assume the extraordinary character of the event<sup>5)</sup>. Probably the reading of the Law means the introduction of the form of the Law which was current in Babylonian Jewish circles in Ezra's time. Later

1) *Statholderen Nehemia* (1916), p. 4f.

2) This opinion is also held by *Torrey*, *Ezra Studies*, p. 261; *Hölscher*, *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses* 1926, p. 122; *Geschichte der isr. u. jüd. Religion* (1922), p. 141, and in *Kautzsch*, 4th ed. II, p. 510; *Loisy*, *La Religion d'Israël* (1933), pp. 228-229; *van Hoonacker*, *Une Communauté Judéo-Araméenne à Éléphantine en Égypte au VI et V siècles av. J.-C.* (1915), pp. 22-23.

3) If this is not an old "ritual weeping", cf. *Hvidberg*, *Graad og Latter i det gamle Testamente* (1938), pp. 85-86.

4) *Teologisk Tidsskrift* (Copenhagen) 1918, pp. 167-168.

5) To the argument above cf. *Egon Johannesen*, *Studier over Ezras og Nehemjas Historie* (1946), p. 296f.; *Bentzen*, *Teologisk Tidsskrift* (1921), pp. 33-39; *Lods*, *Les prophètes d'Israël et les débuts du Judaïsme* (1935), p. 334; *Buhl*, *Det israelitiske Folks Historie* (1937), p. 372; *Theol. Literaturzeitung* 1918, p. 77; *A. Kapelrud*, *The Question of Authorship in the Ezra-Narrative* (*Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo* II, *Hist. Filos. Kl.* 1944, no. 1), p. 92. *Östborn*, *Cult and Canon*, pp. 92, 96.

Judaism here finds the "Great Synagogue" (cf. p. 27), founding Judaism after the Exile and fixing the Canon.

But even if "the Law" at that time was not the complete Pentateuch, not much can have been lacking. We see that both Ezra and Nehemiah as foundations for their work use rules which are found in the latest stratum ("P"). Therefore, even if additions have been made after this time, the *idea* of "the Law of Moses" was at all events that it represented an obligation for the congregation. But a similar idea is presupposed already at the *reform of Josiah* in 621 (2 Ki. 22-23). Here we no doubt find the idea of a *normative Law-Book*; and the precautions taken to make sure that the newly found book is really an expression of the will of God (the consultation of the prophetess Huldah) proves that it was believed that Yahweh could reveal his will by means of a holy book. *Eissfeldt*<sup>1)</sup> rightly points out that this idea originates from the *belief in the word of the inspired person*, the "man of God": the *torah* of the priest, the "*word*" of the prophet or the "*song*" of the inspired poet (Jud. 5, 12), and the *'esāh* of the sage (cf. Jer. 18, 18)<sup>2)</sup>. These are *oral utterances in an actual situation*. But by and by such "words of God" are *fixed in writing*.<sup>3)</sup> According to common opinion this has begun with *laws*, and comparatively early we have the idea that *God himself writes his laws* or personally has dictated them to Moses (Ex. 24, 12; 31, 18; 32, 15-16; 34, 1, 27., of the decalogues)<sup>4)</sup>. *Deuteronomy* is ordered to be deposited in the holy place, and it is prohibited "to add unto it or diminish ought from it" (Deut. 4, 2; 12, 32, cf. Prov. 30, 6; Apoc. 22, 18f.). With the decalogues, however, in their present form we cannot get farther back than to the Deuteronomistic period (cf. II). This seems to indicate that *the 7th century has been especially important for the formation of the idea of a holy written law*. This time is very "literary". It is in this time that *Jeremiah* commits his words from 23 years of toil and tears to writing, and some years later, in *Ezekiel*, we meet the picture of the priest being made a prophet by swallowing a "book" (Jer. 36, cf. 30, 2, Ez. 2, 9-3, 3). *Hölscher*<sup>5)</sup> rightly points out that the words in *Ezekiel* are "significant for the mode of thinking in a literary age"<sup>6)</sup>. But the formula "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it" carries us farther back. It is used e.g. in a very elaborate

<sup>1)</sup> Einleitung, p. 615—Cf. also *Wheeler Robinson*, Inspiration and Revelation in the OT (1946), p. 195f.—On 2 Ki. 22 cf. *Östborn*, op. cit. pp. 16, 18, 96.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Mensching*, op. cit.

<sup>3)</sup> This idea may be traced to the idea of heavenly writings in Ancient Oriental religions.

<sup>4)</sup> *Hesekiel, der Dichter und das Buch* (BZATW 39, 1924), p. 15.

<sup>5)</sup> A cultic reading is also supposed in the case of Deuteronomy (cf. *Östborn*, pp. 91, 96, 100, 103).



form in the imprecations which at the conclusion of the law of Hammurabi are hurled against people who would try to alter the law. Here we are led back to *the ancient idea of a law*, given by a god (here *Shamash*) to a great leader of the state. This of course is formally the foundation of the idea of Moses as Israel's lawgiver. – Another germ of a formation of Canon is probably also found in what has been called “the historical *Credo* of Israel”<sup>1)</sup>, the confession of Israel's salvation from the Egyptians and of Yahweh's gift to Israel: the Holy Land. It is this “*Credo*” which the “Yahwist” has exposed in his—for the faith and thinking of Israel—so epoch-making work (cf. II). The historical *Credo* we find in Deut. 26,5b–9, cf. 6,20–24, Jos. 24,2b–13, and in cultic poetry, e.g. Ps. 136 and Ex. 15. The laws have—as we shall see in our treatment of the forms of literature—according to Noth<sup>2)</sup> been laws of the religious amphictyony Israel, not originally “laws of the state”. Östborn stresses the connection with cultic situations<sup>3)</sup>.

But history also proves that these ideas did *not at once lead to a fixed idea of a Canon*. The different *strata* of the Pentateuch in reality are competing with one another, and even after Deut. has e.g. Ez. 40–48 founded a law-book which in different ways does not agree with the laws of the Pentateuch (cf. II). But by and by the compromise of the finished Pentateuch (cf. II) has asserted itself. This has taken place in the century after the Exile, essentially. And then the oldest and most important part of the OT Canon is an established fact.

Beginnings of a *Canon of Prophets* are found when e.g. *Isaiah* puts the obligation on his *congregation of disciples* to be the bearers and preservers of the word (Is. 8,16, cf. my commentary), and when *Jeremiah* in 605 makes Baruch write down his warnings from the last 23 years (Jer. 36). In the congregations of “sons of prophets” the *word of the master-founder* of course has been invested with divine authority. The Exile has here its great significance by giving the words of the prophets the confirmation of history. Accordingly we see the *post-exilic prophets* (Zech. 1,4 ff., 7,7 ff.) referring to “*the ancient prophets*” and testifying to the importance of Jeremiah's prediction of the 70 years of exile (1,12; 7,5). Already in *Deutero-Isaiah* the references to earlier prophecies play a great part (cf. II). When contemporary prophecy is getting into discredit (Zech. 13,2–3; cf. Neh. 6,7 and 14) and is dying out (1 Macc. 4,46; 9,27; 14,41), the writings of the prophets of old are made an object of learned study, having got the character of “apocalypses”, from which it was thought possible to work out a theory of the future (cf. Dan. 9,2).

<sup>1)</sup> G. von Rad, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs* (1938), pp. 3ff.

<sup>2)</sup> *Die Gesetze im Pentateuch* (Schriften der Königsberger gelehrten Gesellschaft, 1940).

<sup>3)</sup> cf. that Canonical Scriptures are books read in the Service of Synagogue and Church.

It is generally assumed that the character of holiness from the *Prophetæ posteriores* (Is., Jer. Ez., The Minor Prophets) has been extended to the *Prophetæ Priores* (Jos., Jud., Sam., Ki.) (cf. II). The latter are traditionally taken to be written by prophets (cf. II). *Budde*<sup>1)</sup> on the other hand thinks that the remembrance of the original connection between the historical books and the Law (the Deuteronomistic historical work) can have been of importance to make the former historical books canonical. But the theory that these books have been written by prophets (in Talmud *Baba bathra* 14b-15a) was probably already in existence in the 4th century B. C. We see that the *Chronicler* to a great extent talks of prophets among his sources (cf. II). In reality, the *prophetæ priores* contain a great mass of prophetic material. Therefore *Steuernagel* probably is right in thinking that they have been canonized together with *prophetæ posteriores*. Religiously they supplement one another (cf. II). *Daniel and Ecclus.* (48-49) exhibit the *prophetæ posteriores* of the *Palestinian Canon*<sup>2)</sup> in complete form. That means that it has been essentially finished before ca. 200 B. C. On the other hand it is generally supposed that the *Canon of the Samaritans* which only comprises the Law proves that the secession of their Church must have taken place before the Jerusalem orthodoxy acknowledged a Canon of Prophets. Deplorably enough we do not know exactly when the schism occurred. It must have been some time in the 5th or 4th century B. C. But the discussions concerning the canonicity of Ezekiel seem to bear witness that this part of the Canon had not been quite firmly fixed in the 1st century A. D. And the validity of the argument from the form of the Samaritan Canon is weakened by the fact that even the Alexandrian Canon seems to have been of similar extension (cf. below).

The origin of the third part of the Canon, the *Hagiographa*, *Eissfeldt*<sup>3)</sup> will find in the consciousness of inspiration of the Poets and the Wise men which is found both in poetical and the Wisdom Literature. *The Song* is above all the *cultic song*, which is also "a word of power" in which God works<sup>4)</sup>. Besides there is a connection between the singers and the cultic prophets. The sages of the Wisdom literature also regard themselves as inspired<sup>5)</sup>.

In the Canon of the *Hagiographa* the rabbinic discussions of the canonicity of certain writings have found their most important material. That this part of the Canon is most vaguely defined is also expressed in its different names.

<sup>1)</sup> Der Kanon des Alten Testaments (1900), cf. *Steuernagel*, p. 91.

<sup>2)</sup> which does not count *Daniel* among the Prophets.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 617.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. my *Forelæsninger over Indledning til de gammeltestamentlige Salmer* (1932), p. 60, after *Mowinkel*.

<sup>5)</sup> On their connection with cultic circles, see pp. 174f.



Generally it is called the *Ketubim*, "the scriptures" cf. the Prologue of Ecclus. which calls it "the other books of our fathers". In Luke 24,44 this third part of the Canon is only labelled "the Psalms". And its late *date* appears in the fact that *Ben Sira* in his "Praise of the Fathers of Old" (Ecclus. 44-49) shows ignorance of a couple of its writings (Dan. and Ezra). His grandson, however, in his Prologue (ca. 130 B. C.) to the Greek translation bears witness to "the other books of our fathers" (conc. the date, II), without further specification. But he knows the third part of the Canon, and therefore it cannot be doubted that it has had about the size and contents which it has now (cf. below)<sup>1)</sup>.

*The traditional opinion concerning the origin of the Canon.*

According to tradition, e.g. in *Josephus* (*Contra Apionem* I, 38-42) and the *Talmud* (e.g. *Baba bathra* 14b-15a), the canonical Scriptures, 22 in number, have come into existence *between Moses and Ezra*, Moses having written his 5 books and Job; Joshua, Samuel, David, Jeremiah, the men of Hezekiah, "the Great Synagogue", and Ezra the rest of the OT: *Between Moses and king Artaxerxes lies the time of Canonical Literature*. What has been written after this time, *Josephus* says, is not reckoned, because in this later time there is no certain *successio prophetarum*. *Josephus* divides the Canon into three parts: 5 books of Moses, 13 books of Prophets, and 4 books containing hymns and regulations for life. This dictum of *Josephus* comes from the *end of the 1st century A. D.*, and that of the *Talmud* is a so-called *Baraita*, i. e. a teaching which although "outside" the official Mishna, is a tradition from the same time (until 200 A. D.)<sup>2)</sup>.

From about the same period we have information of the origin of the Canon which ascribes to *Ezra* a much more important rôle.<sup>3)</sup> According to the so-called *4 or 2 Book of Esdras* (cf. II), ch. 14, 18-48, *Ezra* in the 30th year after the destruction of Jerusalem, in the year 557, has restored the Scriptures burnt in 587: During 40 days, inspired by God, he dictates 94 books to his assistants. Of these he is told to publish the first 24, but reserve the rest for "the Sages". The 24 public writings correspond to the 22 canonical writings of *Josephus*. The difference is accounted for by assuming that *Josephus* combines *Ruth* with *Judges*, *Lam.* with *Jer.*, and takes *Ezra* + *Nehemiah* as one book, while 4 *Esdras* probably regards *Ruth* and *Lam.* as separate books. *Josephus* presumably also has tried to combine the number of the books with the number of letters in the alphabet (cf. below).

<sup>1)</sup> cf. the *Appendix*.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 619, note 2 and II, p. 199, n. 5.

<sup>3)</sup> Concerning the later tradition of *Ezra*, cf. *Egon Johannesen*, *Studier over Ezras og Nehemjas Historie* (1946), pp. 304-307.

This theory is, in the time of the Reformation, developed in a more rational way by the Jewish scholar *Elias Levita*. In his book *Massoreth-ha-Massoreth*, published in 1538, he says that *Ezra* and his companions combined the books which until their time were handed down separately and arranged them in the 3 parts of the Canon, their order, however, not being the same, as that which is used by "our wise men" in *Baba bathra*. Moreover he assumed that "the Great Synod" or "the Great Synagogue" mentioned in *Baba bathra* is identical with *Ezra* and his companions, their assembly being described in Neh. 8-10. This theory is taken over by Protestant orthodoxy: *Buxtorf* sen. (d. 1629), *Hottinger* (d. 1667), *Leusden* (d. 1699) and *Carpzow* (d. 1767). It is not until the time of 18th century rationalism that this theory is shaken. It is just as romantic as the theory of II Macc. 1,10-2,18 of a library founded by Nehemiah.<sup>1)</sup>

*Literature:* A. Kuenen, *Over de mannen der groote Synagoge* (1876); German translation in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (1894), pp. 125-150. G. A. Marx-Gustaf Dalman, *Traditio veterrima de librorum Vet. Test. ordine atq; origine* (1884). G. F. Moore, *Judaism III* (1930), pp. 7-11. The theory of a library of *Nehemiah* has in the Christian Church a just as fantastic parallel in the idea of a library founded by the Apostles in Jerusalem (cf. *Archbishop Timotheus of Alexandria: Sermon on Abbatô*, ed. Wallis Budge, *Coptic Martyrdoms in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (1914), p. 226).—On II Macc. 1,10-2,18 cf. *Abel's commentary* (1949).

### *The finishing of the Jewish Canon.*

How the Canon really has come into existence, was sketched above (pp. 21 ff.) We are now left to describe the definite *development of the Palestinian Canon*. We saw that about the beginning of our era the uncertain section was its *third part*. The grandson of *Ben Sira* knows this part and mentions it ca. 130 B. C. in his Prologue to the Greek translation of his grandfather's Hebrew work. The historian *Eupolemus* ca. 157 B. C. has used a Greek translation of Chron.: and there is also witness to the early use of a Greek translation of Job (cf. below). In the 2nd century B. C., therefore, we can see traces of translations of important parts of the *Hagiographa*<sup>2)</sup>. This strengthens the assumption that the grandson of *Ben Sira* with his words "the other books of our fathers" alludes to a collection which is essentially our *Hagiographa*. But the difference in the numbers of books in *Josephus* and *4 Esdras* (cf. above) proves that even if the Canon about 100 A. D. had nearly the same contents, its books were

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Buhl*, *Skriptoverlevering* (1885), p. 24. *Steuernagel*, pp. 90 and 92.

<sup>2)</sup> This does not mean an evidence of the existence of a Greek authorized version of the Scriptures outside the Pentateuch (a "Septuagint" containing more than the Law, cf. below, pp. 80 ff.).



arranged in different ways. And the books of the *New Testament*, from the time between the grandson of Ben Sira and Josephus-4 Esdras, prove, too, that the Canon of Hagiographa has not been formally fixed. Lk. 24,44 has it represented by the Psalms only. But Mt. 23,35 seems to know 2 Chron (24,20 f.) as the last book of the Canon <sup>1)</sup>: This seems to indicate that it knows of a rather complete Canon. It is worth noting that the books disputed by the rabbis, Cant., Eccl., and Esther, are not quoted in the New Testament. The same, however, holds true concerning Ezra-Neh. But it may be considered probable that there was no occasion for quoting these books<sup>2)</sup>. Mt. 23,35 which first alludes to a situation from Genesis and then probably to one from Chron. therefore seems to indicate that the whole Palestinian Canon existed at the time of Jesus and the Apostles.

Important for the definite fixing of the Canon among the Semitic speaking Jews was the *synod of Jamnia* (Jabne) held ca. 100 A. D.

The catastrophe in the year 70 A. D. had robbed Judaism of its external centre at Jerusalem. In this desperate situation it stood facing the invasion of the *Hellenistic syncretism*, just as the Christian Church in the next century. "For thy Law is burnt; and so no man knows the things which have been done by thee, or the works that shall be done. If, then, I have found favour before thee, send into me the Holy Spirit, that I may write all that has happened in the world since the beginning, even the things which were written in thy Law, in order that men may be able to find the path, and that they who would live at the last, may live" (4 Ezra 14,21-23) "The Law of our fathers has been brought to destruction, the written covenants exist no more" (4,23). Especially against *Apocalyptic Literature*, so strongly influenced by syncretism, the congregation of Jewish scholars had to raise a standard of faith and life, able to show what was genuine Judaism and what not<sup>2a)</sup>. Besides, the *circumference of the Canon* had not yet been clearly defined, the Egyptian Jews e.g. having greater collections of writings, many of which were not acknowledged in Palestine<sup>3)</sup>. To all this came the relations to the young *Church of Christ*, which not only leaned upon the same Canon as Judaism, the Old Testament, but also, as the Christian interpolations and adaptations of pseudepigraphic literature show (cf. II), was very interested in the apocalypses, and which in its Canon, founded by means of Greek translations (the "LXX"), embraced writings which Judaism

<sup>1)</sup> This is not quite certain, if the words in Mt. 23,35 allude to the events mentioned by Josephus, Bell. IV, 334ff. But this does not seem probable (cf. Mosbech, Nytestamentlig Isagogik (1946), p. 218, n. 2).

<sup>2)</sup> Eissfeldt, p. 624. - <sup>2a)</sup> This may have had consequences for Daniel (cf. II, p. 199, n. 5).

<sup>3)</sup> and most probably not in Egypt, where only the Law seems to have been canonical cf. (below pp. 35 ff.).

had never officially acknowledged<sup>1)</sup>). All this makes it necessary for the rabbis to go down to the foundations of Judaism and take up discussions of the contents of the Canon.

The debate on the synod mainly centred on *Ezekiel*, *Proverbs*, *the Song of Songs*, *Ecclesiastes*, and *Esther*. There also seems to have been some insecurity concerning *Chronicles*. This seems to indicate that only the Law was really acknowledged also in Palestinian circles; or at least that Prophets and Ketubim were considered of secondary importance.

In the case of *Ezekiel* (cf. II) the discussions in the first place took up the relations between the book of the prophet and the Law, secondly some mystical teachings associated with the vision in chs. 1-3, combined with Gen. 1: There was a danger of getting into theosophic speculations, which were prohibited.<sup>2)</sup> There were also people who would prohibit ch. 16; but at last both ch. 1 and 16 were allowed to be read in the synagogues<sup>3)</sup>. Moore asserts<sup>4)</sup> that there is a difference between the treatment of *Ezekiel* and that of the *Song of Songs*, *Ecclesiastes* and *Sirach*. Concerning *Ezekiel* the discussion does not tend to declare that the book is "apocryphal", but only to exclude it from public reading in the synagogues, because it might be dangerous for learned or half-learned persons who might be led astray into doubts on account of its dissensions from the Law. In this connection Moore draws attention to the expressions used (cf. p. 21). A memory of the cautions imposed on *Ezekiel* is perhaps that in our time, according to Cooke<sup>5)</sup>, Ez. 1 is read only in Hebrew, without translation. Jews below the age of thirty are not allowed to study Ez. 1.

Concerning *Proverbs* we have the same position as in case of Ez.: *Shabbath 30b* (cf. *Megilla 7a*) we encounter the same verb as signification for the "hiding" of this book. That means that in this case too the tendency was to exclude it from public reading, not from the Canon. In Prov. was found a contradiction between 26,4 and 26,5, but it was solved by assuming that v. 4 speaks of discussions on the Law, v. 5 on worldly affairs<sup>6)</sup>.

Of *Ecclesiastes* and the *Song of Songs*, on the other hand, the adversaries of the canonicity in the older *Mishnah*-texts, *Yadaim III*, 5, use the more rigo-

<sup>1)</sup> Moore, *Judaism I*, p. 241.

<sup>2)</sup> Moore, op. cit. p. 300.-Bab. Hagiga 13.

<sup>3)</sup> Ez. 1, 1-28 and 3,12 are now *Haftaroth* (cf. p. 49f) for the first day of the Feast of Weeks, cf. Hertz, *Pentateuch and Haftorahs V*, Deuteronomy (1936), pp. 590 and 592; Hertz does not account for ch. 16. The two chs. 16 and 23 cannot well be used in a service to day.

<sup>4)</sup> p. 247.

<sup>5)</sup> in his commentary on Ez. (*Intern. Crit. Comm.*) (1936), p. 23.

<sup>6)</sup> Moore I, p. 246.



rous words: that these books "do not defile the hands", meaning that they are not holy writings. In later periods it seems that the adversaries then retired to the same position as concerning Ezekiel: to have these books excluded from public use in the synagogues.

The book of Ecclesiastes had long been an object of dispute. Rabbi *Hillel* regarded the book as holy, but his antagonist *Shammai* rejected it (*Mishnah*, Eduyoth V, 3, Yadaim III, 5; *Talmud*, Megilla 7a). The *synod of Jamnia* could not bring the dispute to an end. *Simon ben Menasya*, a contemporary of the illustrious rabbi *Judah*<sup>1)</sup>, asserted (cf. *Talmud*, Megillah 7a) that *Qoheleth* "does not defile the hands", because it is Solomon's own wisdom. Here, then, is used the severe expression declaring a book profane. And *Jerome*, at the end of the 4th century A. D., tells us that his Jewish teachers said: *quum inter caetera scripta Salomonis quae antiquata sunt, nec in memoria duraverunt, et hic liber oblitterandus esse videretur, eo quod vanas Dei assereret creaturas, et totum putaret esse pro nihilo, et cibum, et potum et delicias transeuntes praeferret omnibus, ex hoc uno capitulo (sc. 12,13s.) meruisse auctoritatem, ut in divinorum voluminum numero poneretur. . .*<sup>2)</sup>.

In the same manner there has been dispute concerning the *Song of Songs*. The information given by the *Mishnah*, Yadaim III, 5, concerning the dispute, and the sharp words of rabbi *Akiba* against people who sang it in taverns, i.e. as a profane song (cf. II), show that the matter has been difficult. *Talmud*, Megillah 7a, still remembers the contest, cf. *Tosefta Sanhedrin XII*.

About *Esther* there was a very long dispute. As late as the 3rd century A. D. we find a rabbi *Samuel* who declared that "Esther does not defile the hands" (*Talmud*, Megillah 7a). According to *Moore*<sup>3)</sup> the words of the *Talmud*: "It was not written by the Holy Ghost? Yes, but it was only to be recited, not to be written!" mean that the *Talmud* tries to save the orthodoxy of rabbi *Samuel*<sup>4)</sup>. A similar instance, that rabbis would not acknowledge the canonicity of *Esther*, we find in *Talmud*, Sanhedrin 110b. And perhaps it is a reminiscence of this that *Esther* is not found in the list of Holy Writings compiled by *Melito of Sardis*.<sup>5)</sup>

The cause for rejecting *Esther* has not been a moral one, but that the *festival of Purim* was controversial to the principle that the *Law of Moses* was complete (*Lev.* 27,34), and that no prophet after *Moses* could introduce new festivals. This is expressly done according to *Esther* 9,21 ff., 29 ff. But the difficulty was overcome; a

<sup>1)</sup> *Moore* I, p. 242.

<sup>2)</sup> quoted by *Moore*, III, p. 66f.

<sup>3)</sup> I, p. 238, cf. III, p. 69.

<sup>4)</sup> *Moore* III, p. 69.

<sup>5)</sup> But cf. *Moore*, I, p. 246.

tradition in the Jerusalem Talmud says<sup>1)</sup>: Already when *Mordecai's* and *Esther's* letters came to Palestine, the difficulty was felt. But a great congregation of 85 Elders, among them between 30 and 40 prophets, found the necessary Scripture-evidence in all three parts of the Canon. Nay, it was asserted that the book was revealed to Moses on Sinai, but not written until the days of Esther and Mordecai. This removed the difficulty that it introduces non-Mosaic festivals!

Since the oldest *Syriac* translation did not include *Chronicles* this is perhaps a sign of the uncertain position of this book.

From all this we gather that even if the synod of *Jamnia* made an effort to define the Canon, the issues were not finally settled. Down to the time of *Jerome* the memory of the contest is preserved, so that the Christian Father can be informed of it by his Jewish teachers. But *Talmudic tradition* also proves that the antagonism against certain books is silenced little by little. For a time some of the books (*Ezekiel*, *Eccl.*) are thought by some rabbis worthy of acception in the Canon, but not of public reading, or parts of them are excluded from public reading in the synagogues.

One thing more has however to be noted concerning the *Jamnia synod*: Its discussions have not so much dealt with acceptance of certain writings into the Canon, but rather with their *right to remain there*<sup>2)</sup>. That *Ez.* is mentioned in this connection is a proof of this. For the Canon of Prophets had then long been finished. If we study the discussions in the *Mishna* and the *Talmud* we see that it is always *presupposed that the disputed books are canonical*. The question is always: Do the books fulfil the claims of the theory held by the rabbis concerning the character of a canonical book? Are there dogmatic or moral heresies in the books? Do they contain contradictions? Are they at variance with the Law? etc. The synod of *Jamnia* did not define the Canon, but it undertook a *revision*. The Canon in reality was finished before the time of the synod, but perhaps more in the character of a collection grown out of practical use. The synod of the rabbis tries to account for the right of the *books* to be parts of the *Book*.

#### *The order of the books.*

From the days of the synod of *Jamnia* and perhaps already in the time of the *grandson of Ben Sira*<sup>3)</sup> the Hebrew Canon is fixed, in spite of the ever running discussion during the following centuries: The sayings of tradition, quoted in the previous paragraphs, all assert the holiness of the disputed books.

<sup>1)</sup> Megillah 70d, quoted by *Moore*, I, p. 245.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Buhl*, Skriftoverlevering, p. 12f.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. above p. 26.

According to the words of 4 Ezra quoted above, the Jews counted 24 *Holy Books*, taking the Dodecapheton, Samuel, Kings, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles each as one single book. *Josephus's* number, 22 books, may have been influenced by theories similar to those met with in Hellenistic Jewish tradition<sup>1)</sup>.

The *tripartition of the Canon* is fixed rather early. It is testified *ca.* 130 B. C. in the prologue of the *grandson of Ben Sira* to his translation of his grandfather's work. It is also known in the time towards the end of the 1st century A. D. in Lk. 24,44.

The *sequence of the books outside the Law* is somewhat uncertain: *Baba bathra* 14b-15a give the order of the *prophetae posteriores* as Jer., Ez., Is., 12. Proph., while the *Massora* has the well-known order: Is., Jer., Ez., 12. Proph. The *rabbis* discuss if the order ought to be *chronological*, or start from the *size of the books*. But they end by explaining the order by means of their opinion of their contents: Jer. only speaks of destruction, Ez. has both threats and consolation, while Is. contains consolation only (!). This should account for the order of the three first books: "We therefore combine destruction with destruction and promise with promise"<sup>2)</sup>.

The order of the *Hagiographa* is still more difficult. The *Psalms* have nearly always been at the head of the collection. But *Baba bathra* puts *Ruth* first. Then there is some uncertainty in the question if *Job* or *Prov.* ought to come directly after the *Psalms*, and *Baba bathra* discusses if *Job*, living in the time of Moses, ought not to be the first book in the collection. The list of *Baba bathra* has not the 5 *Megilloth* as a separate corpus. For this small collection of five books (Cant., Ruth, Threni, Eccl., Esther) as a separate unit inside the Canon we have no evidence until the 6th century A.D., and not until the 12th century is it a fixed custom that these books are arranged in the order of the calendar festivals to which they belong.

But there are also other manners of arrangement, which we cannot enumerate here. The differences of arrangement of the books outside the Law certainly points to the fact, that these books were not so important as the Law itself. The present order of the books has gradually grown out of the tendency towards uniformity of the manuscripts which is the issue of the work of the *massoretes*.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 26.—Conc. other ways of numbering, cf. p. 40.

<sup>2)</sup> Concerning the position of Is., cf. *Buhl*, Skriftoverlevering, p. 27; cf. *Appendix* to p. 26, line 9.



*The idea of the Canon among the Palestinian Jews.*

It is obvious, then, that the Canon did not come into existence because the Jews had a preconceived idea of a Canon, defining the nature of books which were to be counted among the Holy Books. We have seen that originally it was the *Law* that was the Canon, and the idea of the Canon was of an essentially religious-legal character. It was not only *inspiration* which determined the rank of the Law, for also the books of the prophets were considered inspired. But the decisive feature was the *covenant* contracted under binding *cultic* forms (2 Ki. 23, 1ff., cf. Neh. 8). This also leaves its mark on the theological view of the "Deuteronomistic" and "Priestly" documents of the Pentateuch, where these documents are made binding on the people by means of the covenants at Mount Sinai or in Moab<sup>1)</sup>. More and more the covenant at Mount *Sinai* attains its dominating position. It is the Law, given on Mount Sinai and accepted by the people through a solemn covenant, which is to regulate faith and life in Israel. Inspiration is not enough.

But from the Law authority was transferred to its *historical framework*, and therefore a change took place: Besides the religious-legal obligation *the idea of the Canon also must comprise the material of religious history*.

Of course not only the *contents* of the Law were important. The *form* too became fixed, "holy". The development of the Yahwistic source of the "historical Credo" of Israel is perhaps an ancient germ of an idea of a Canon (cf. above p. 24), built on something which had nearly the character of a confession of faith.

*The rest of the books are not canonical in the same sense as the Torah*<sup>2)</sup>. Even if the Jews may have had a remembrance of the original literary connection between the *Torah* and the following historical books (the *prophetæ priores*) as part of the original Deuteronomistic work of history<sup>3)</sup>, and even if it was presupposed that not only the *prophetæ posteriores*, but also the *priores* were written by prophets of acknowledged authority<sup>4)</sup>, these books nevertheless never attained the same rank as the *Torah*. When the time came when no prophets appeared (cf. Zech. 1,4; 13,2ff.), the ancient prophets certainly got an unequalled position<sup>5)</sup>. Their teaching had to be preserved, but the *superiority of the Torah* is kept up: The rest of the books get the name of *Eshlemtha* or *Qabbala*, "tradition". It is held

<sup>1)</sup> Steuernagel, p. 95.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 29.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. above p. 25.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. p. 25.

<sup>5)</sup> Steuernagel, p. 90.

that these books do not add anything to the *Torah* (cf. what was said above of the Book of *Esther*), but only interpret it to their own times. *Steuernagel* underlines that this is an underestimation of the prophets especially; but this is, nevertheless, the opinion of the Jews. We have also seen that e.g. in the discussions concerning the canonicity of certain books (*Ez.*, *Esth.*, *Eccl.*) the *Law* is normative.

A decisive element in the definition of the idea of the Canon was also, as we have seen, the quite external fact that only the *books written between the times of Moses and Artaxerxes* had the binding character of holy, formally and materially immutable Scriptures, for the rule and regulation of faith and life.

The strict idea of Canon was however not always carried through consistently. We have seen that in the end of the 1st century there still was so much uncertainty that the canonicity of some books had to be examined afresh at the synod of Jamnia. Before that time there must have been a *tendency to accept more writings* than those that are now considered canonical. The *Talmud* still gives evidence of apocryphal books being quoted as canonical. Thus *Ecclus.* 7,36 is quoted *Pirke Aboth* III,2; 9,9 in I,3; 11,28 in II,5.<sup>1)</sup> cf. the allusion to *Ecclus.* 13,15 in *Baba qamma* 92b<sup>2)</sup>. Also the NT gives evidence of a somewhat wider conception of the Canon, see e.g. *Lk.* 11,49; *Jo.* 7,38; *1. Cor.* 2,9; *Eph.* 5,14 and above all *Jude* 14–16, perhaps also *Mt.* 27,9 where quotations of apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books have been assumed with more or less certainty<sup>3)</sup>. With *Steuernagel* we also may draw attention to the fact that the *Syrian Church* presumably did not accept *Chronicles*. This book is not found in the oldest Syriac Bible. From all this it is clear that the definition of the Canon among Palestinian Jews did not find full approval in other parts of the Jewish world. Disagreement inside Palestine is attested among the *Samaritans*, and outside the Holy Land especially in the Jewish diaspora in *Egypt*.

### *The Canon of the Samaritans.*

The Canon of the Samaritans only comprises the 5 *Books of the Torah*. Besides the Samaritans have an adaptation of the book of *Joshua*, containing a continuation of history down to the times of the Roman emperors. This shorter Canon is generally explained by assuming that the congregation of the Sama-

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Box and Oesterley* in *Charles*, *Apocrypha* I, p. 297.

<sup>2)</sup> *Box and Oesterley* ad loc., cf. the declarations concerning the non-canonical state of the book, quoted by *Steuernagel*, p. 93.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Schürer*, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 4th ed. III, p. 369; *Steuernagel*, p. 98.

ritans separated itself from the Jerusalemites at a time when the Jews had not yet developed their prophetic and hagiographic parts of the Canon. Others think that the Samaritans rejected the prophetic and hagiographic parts because they contain so many anti-Ephraimite words.

It is probably a mistake when some of the *Church-Fathers* (Origen, Jerome a. o., cf. Schürer, op. cit. II, p. 480; Lagrange, *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ* (1931), p. 304, n. 2) have thought that the *Sadducees* like the *Samaritans* limited their Canon to the Law alone and rejected the Prophets and the Hagiographa. Lagrange thinks it possible that the Sadducees rejected *Daniel*, because they did not accept the belief in the resurrection of the dead, but we know nothing of it, and it is at all events not likely that they rejected the Prophets, as they would have brought themselves into an intolerable antagonism towards their people, by doing so. – The theory of the Fathers probably is founded upon a misunderstanding of a passage in *Josephus* (Ant. XVIII, 15), who says that the *Sadducees* only acknowledge as Law that which is written, and not oral tradition (cf. Schürer, loc. cit.), and upon another misunderstanding, viz. of Jewish sayings which ironically compared the *Sadducees* with the Samaritans (Lagrange, loc. cit.). Schürer, like Budde (*Der Kanon des Alten Testaments*, p. 42f.), thinks it possible that they would only let the Law be regarded as the Canon in the strict sense of the word. But that is the usual Jewish opinion. Among the orthodox Jews too the Hagiographa occupy a less prominent position than the Law and the Prophets, which alone are used for readings in the Synagogue on the Sabbaths – cf. the list of Sidras and Haftorahs in Hertz, *The Pentateuch and Haftorahs I-V* (1936).

## THE CANON OF ALEXANDRIA

For the history of the Canon it has been of great importance that at an early date there existed a collection of the Holy Scriptures of the Jews which in some respects differs from that of the Palestinian Jews. This important different collection is that of the *Egyptian Jews*, commonly called the “Septuagint” (LXX). This collection acquired its greatest importance through the fact that it was taken over by the *Church*, where it has had an overwhelming influence upon the formation of the Christian Canon. Recent research has moreover stressed this last circumstance in a way which makes the Alexandrian Canon a witness to Jewish views of the Canon more markedly different from other forms of the Jewish Canon.

The spiritual centre of the Egyptian Jews from the beginning of the Hellenistic period was the great world-city of *Alexandria*. The idea of the Canon which we meet here seems to be similar to that of the Samaritans. The *Law* dominates the thinking to such a degree that the Prophets and the Hagiographa get lesser importance. These parts of the Alexandrian Bible are not so strictly defined as the Law. According to the current view the Alexandrian Canon only clothes the *Law* with *canonical* dignity. The *other books* are regarded as *books of edifica-*



tion, and they are *arranged* according to a principle quite different from the Palestinian tripartition, namely according to their *contents*. And lastly: The *number* of these books of edification is not clearly fixed. There is a number of books which are accepted in manuscripts of the Bible outside the usual Biblical books, but in this respect the manuscripts – which all have been handed down by the Church – vary to some extent.<sup>1)</sup>

It therefore seems that the Egyptian Jews did not possess a definitely fixed number of holy books. This corresponds to the circumstance that the most conspicuous author of Alexandrian Jewry, the philosopher *Philo* who flourished in the second fourth part of the 1st century A.D. (between ca. 25 and 50), apparently does not acknowledge the Palestinian theory limiting the period of Revelation to the time between Moses and Artaxerxes. He represents the opinion of the Wisdom literature: that the Sages are inspired, e.g. also the Greek translators of the Law.<sup>2)</sup> Practically, however, he uses the same books as the Palestinians, generally quoting the books acknowledged by them. But it is significant that he has ca. 2000 quotations from the Law against only ca. 50 from the other books. *Josephus*<sup>3)</sup> seems to use the Palestinian tripartite Bible, but on the other hand he makes profuse use of acanonical and profane writings. Like the “LXX” he seems to have had Ruth after Judges and Lamentations after Jeremiah (Ant. V, 318ff.).

The order of the books in the Alexandrian Canon is supposed to be that of the LXX. The manuscripts nevertheless vary to a certain degree in this respect. After the *Law* follow the *historical books*, then the *poetical* and *didactical* writings, while the *prophetical books* conclude the collection. *Ruth* is associated with Judges, and *Chron.* and *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* follow immediately after *Kings* together with *Esther*. We also note that the books of *Samuel* and *Kings* are counted as 1–4 Libri Regnorum. In the *poetical parts* the books generally stand in the following order: Ps., Prov., Eccl., Cant., Job. The *Prophets* begin with the *Dodecapropheton*, but in an order deviating from that of the Massoretic text: *Hos.*, *Am.*, *Micah*, *Joel*, *Ob.*, *Jonah*, *Nah.*, *Hab.*, *Zeph.*, *Hag.*, *Zech.*, *Mal.* Then we find the *Greater Prophets*, generally in the order known from our translated Bibles, Daniel being reckoned among the Prophets. A varying number of *Apocrypha* and *Pseudepigrapha* are found in the manuscripts. To the Psalms a collection of *Odae* is added. After Job stand *The Wisdom of Salomon*

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 626.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Steuernagel*, p. 98; *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 137ff.; below, p. 83, n. 2.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Kahle*, op. cit. pp. 150ff.; cf. below, p. 79, n. 3.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. II.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. II.

and the *Psalms of Salomon*, and after Jeremiah we find *Baruch*, after Lamentations *The Epistle of Jeremiah*. Daniel is preceded by the story of *Susanna* and followed by *Bel and the Dragon*. Among the historical books we find 1(3) *Esdras* before the canonical book (called 2 *Esdr.*), after Esther with its apocryphal additions the books of *Judith* and *Tobit*, and the four books of the *Macca-bees*. But also other books are found in the manuscripts. There also are differences in the forms of certain books, compared with the Massoretic text (e.g. Kings, Jeremiah, and Daniel).

The current view of the Alexandrian Canon must now be revised in the light thrown upon the LXX by *Paul Kahle*<sup>1)</sup>.

*Kahle* has made it probable in the highest degree that the name "*Septuaginta*" was originally, among the Jews, only attached to the translation of the Law to which the Letter of *Aristeas* gives evidence. This translation was a revision of older translations, undertaken at the time of the letter (ca. 100 B.C.) in order to create a standard edition of the Law in Greek. The books outside the Law were never collected in a canonical anthology among the Jews in Egypt. A great number of translations of all the books existed, but no standard edition attached to the "LXX", i.e. the Law. The "LXX" as we know it now is a creation of the Church which was in need of a canonical Greek Translation. Such a complete Greek Bible was created by the Church by means of older material, of course coming from Jewish sources. But the Jews themselves had no standard edition of the material outside the Law.

This of course is of great importance for the history of the Canon and for our view of the Canon of the Egyptian Jews. More clearly we now perceive that the Law was the real Canonical Scripture among the Alexandrians, and that the other books were merely books of edification. The Canon of the larger "LXX" is a Canon of the Church, not of the Greek Synagogue.

*Literature:* *Swete*, Introduction of the OT in Greek, revised by *Ottley* (1914). Concerning *Philo*, comp. the fundamental work by C. F. *Hornemann*, *Observationes ad illustrationem doctrinae de canone Veteris Testamenti ex Philone* (Copenhagen 1775). *Hornemann* overlooked that *Philo* once quotes Chron. (cf. *Buhl*, *Skriftoverlev.* (1885), p. 17). *Siegfried*, *Philo als Ausleger des Alten Testaments* (1875). Concerning the book *De vita contemplativa*, ascribed to *Philo*, in which an allusion to the tripartite Canon is found, cf. *Mosbech*, *Essæismen* (Copenhagen 1916). *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 132-179. *P. Katz*, *Philo's Bible* (1950), cf. *Kahle*, *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (1951), pp. 36ff.

<sup>1)</sup> In his *Schweich Lectures* 1941, cf. below pp. 80ff.



## THE CANON IN THE CHURCH

The Canon of the Christian Church was very soon influenced in a decisive way by the form which the OT had assumed in the Greek world. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph recent investigation has shown that the Church has had a great influence of its own on the formation of the Greek Bible in its final form. The Greek Canon of the Church is mainly the work of the Church which enlarges the Alexandrian Canon, originally consisting of the Law alone, by adding material from translations made by the Jews, and so shaping a Canon, even greater than the Palestinian, because it includes works, declared acanonical by the rabbis after 70 A.D. With some justification it may be said that the Greek Canon of the Church comes into existence, because the Palestinian Canon, as it perhaps looked before the debates of Jamnia, at least in some circles, was the original Canon of the primitive Church, and so had formed Church thinking, that the Greek Christianity, probably already in the days of Paul, could not restrict itself to the Alexandrian Canon, which was the Law alone, but had to use also the books, regarded by the Hellenistic Jews only as books of edification: The "LXX" in its Church form represents the influence of the Palestinian Canon upon the Alexandrian text of the Bible.

The process of forming a Church Canon of the Greek OT having come to an end, presumably in the 2nd century A.D.<sup>1)</sup>, discussions similar to those among the Palestinian Jews are aroused in the Church. We perceive a *tendency to draw the boundaries more tightly* in accord with Palestinian tradition. But on the other hand we meet a mind more friendly towards e.g. *Apocalyptic writings*, tending to *expand the Canon*. Between these two fighting tendencies the churches in the course of time develop their different solutions.

The *Greek Orthodox Church* has – after some wavering between several points of view – in a *concilium in Jerusalem in 1672* accepted *Wisdom, Eccus., Tob., and Judith* as *canonical*. Earlier these books had occupied an inferior place as *anaginoskόμενα* or *apókrypha*<sup>2)</sup>.

The *Roman Church* decides its attitude in the *council of Trent* (Sess. IV, 1546). As *Canonical Scriptures* are accepted; The *additions to Dan. and Esther*, further, *Bar., Ep. Jer., 1–2 Macc., Judith, Tob., Eccus., and Wisd.* besides the Palestinian collection. *3 and 4 Esdras* and the *Prayer of Manasses* are taken into the NT. This is only a codification of the decisions already reached in the synods of *Hippo* (393) and *Carthage* (419).

<sup>1)</sup> Kahle, Schweich Lectures 1941, p. 158.

<sup>2)</sup> *Steuernagel*, p. 99.

A fresh start is made by the *Churches of the 16th century Reformation*. Under the impression of the claim raised by the new learning of *Humanism* that science had to go back to the oldest sources, the reformers took up the *Palestinian Canon* as their basis for Church Theology. The arrangement of the books as it was found in the Christian LXX and the Vulgate was retained. But the *Apocrypha* were not regarded as foundations of the faith. *Luther* kept *Judith*, *Tob.*, *Ecclus.*, *Bar.*, *Ep. Jer.*, *1-2 Macc.* and the *additions to Esther and Dan.* in his Bible, but with the rubric "Apokrypha, das sind Bücher, so nicht der hl. Schrift gleichgehalten, und doch nützlich und gut zu lesen sind", i.e. he regarded them as books of edification. Besides he was critical towards several of the canonical books of both the OT and NT, cf. e.g. the important declaration in *De servo arbitrio* (WA 18, p. 666), about *Esther* "dignior omnibus, me iudice, qui extra canonem haberetur": Not only in the "Tischreden" which are not to be taken so seriously as expressions of his theology, but in a book which he himself ranged with his Minor Catechism he asserts his critical attitude towards a Biblical book. The Reformed Churches following *Calvin* completely gave up the canonicity of the Apocrypha and excluded them from the Bible. This by and by caused the lamentable "*contests concerning the Apocrypha*" ("Apokryphenstreit") which induced the British and Foreign Bible Society, under pressure of Scotch Puritanism, to declare that it would not publish Bibles containing the Apocrypha and not collaborate with other societies which include these books in their editions.<sup>1)</sup>

On the subject: The *Apocrypha in the Church*, a convenient survey is given by *W. O. E. Oesterley*, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* (1935), cf. also *Buhl*, *Skriftoverlevering*, and *Demefeld*, *Histoire des livres de l'Ancien Testament* (1929), the latter giving a representation of the Roman view; cf. also the more detailed and clear representation in *Torrey*, *The Apocryphal Literature* (1948), pp. 16-40.

Concerning the *number of the canonical books* we find the double number which was given in *Josephus* and *4 Esdras*: Some count 22, others 24 books, or even other numbers.

*Origen* (ap. *Eusebius*, *Hist. eccl.* VI, 25) like *Josephus* uses the number 22, but not the tripartition into 5 books of laws, 13 prophetic books, and 4 books of hymns and practical exhortations. *Jerome* in his *Prologus Galeatus* also talks of 22 books (prol. to *Kings*), but he shows knowledge of the arrangement which leads to the number 24: "quamquam nonnulli Ruth et Cinoth inter Hagiographos scriptitent et libros hos in suo putent numero supputandos, ac per hoc esse priscae legis libros viginti quattuor"; cf. the preface to *Dan.* where he strongly stresses the position of *Daniel* among the Hagiographa: "Illud admoneo non haberi Daniele apud Hebraeos inter prophetas, sed inter eos, qui Hagiographa conscrip-

<sup>1)</sup> cf. RGG, 2nd. ed., col. 1022. *Torrey*, *The Apocryphal Literature* § 8.



scrunt. In tres siquidem partes omnis Sacra Scriptura ab eis dividitur, in Legem, in Prophetas et in Hagiographa, i. e. in quinque, in octo et undecim libros".

The *provenience of the number 22* is dubious. Generally it is combined with the number of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet. But how this has been attained we do not know. It is assumed that we have here a later artificial reckoning (*Buhl*). Possibly the combination of Ruth with Judges and Lam. with Jer. in the LXX shows that the number 22 originated in Greek translations. This assumption is strengthened through another arrangement which counts 27 books, possibly founded upon a reckoning which takes the 22 letters of the alphabet + the 5 special letters used at the end of words. For this reckoning is curiously enough only possible in the Greek texts dividing Sam., Kings, Chron., and Ezra-Neh. in two books each. But then it must be assumed that Ruth and Lam. nevertheless are taken as separate books, against the use of the LXX. The division at all events presupposes knowledge of the Hebrew alphabet<sup>1</sup>).—As mentioned p. 30, *Melito of Sardis* had a Canon of his own not containing Esther. Being able, nevertheless, to count 22 books he must have taken Ruth as a separate book.

Evidence of the use of the *Apocrypha in the Church* is found in 1 Clem. 27,5, quoting Wisd. 12,12 as a word of God. 55,3–6 allusion is made to *Judith* and *Esther*. The *Epistle of Barnabas* 12,1 quotes 4 Ezra 4,33 and 5,5, and in 6,7 Wisd. 2,12 is referred to in confusion with Is. 3,9–10, showing that these two books were regarded as equally authoritative<sup>2</sup>). Upon the whole a glance upon an index of Bible-passages in editions of the *Apostolic Fathers* makes it clear that the Apocrypha are quoted very frequently<sup>3</sup>).

As an evidence of the *authority of the Apocrypha* in the Church *Oesterley* rightfully draws attention to the fact that *Tob.*, *Judith*, and *Macc.* often have rendered material for artists who painted the decorations of the *catacombs*.<sup>4</sup>) He also points out that the tendency to let the Apocrypha take a less prominent position starts in the 4th century in the writings of *Athanasius*, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, *Epiphanius*, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, and *Gregory Nazianzen*. These Fathers did not acknowledge the Apocrypha, but nevertheless they quote them with the formulas used in quotations from the accepted canonical books. We also know that *Theodore of Mopsuestia* rejected Chron., Ezr.-Neh., Esther, and even Job, and that the *Nestorians* did not include Ezr.-Neh. and Esther in their Canon, but accepted Ecclus. and the additions to Dan. In the *Western Church* on the contrary the tendency is to accept the Apocrypha (the synods of Hippo 393 and Carthage 419; *Augustine*, *Innocent I* and *Gelasius*). A representative of the more rigoristic view is *Jerome*, but this is accounted for by his stay in the Orient, where he studied Hebrew and generally got into touch with the view of the Eastern Church. Accordingly he introduces the idea of "Apocrypha" as signifying what he called "libri

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Audet*, Journ. of Theol. Stud. (1950), pp. 135 ff.)—a list with a peculiar arrangement.

<sup>2</sup>) *Oesterley*, Introd. to the Apocr., p. 125.

<sup>3</sup>) see e.g. the index to the edition of *Funk*.

<sup>4</sup>) op. cit. p. 126.



*ecclesiastici*" as different from "*libri canonici*". This is a new, not invidious use of the word "apocryphal", (cf. p. 21). A similar attitude we find in *Hilary of Poitiers* and *Rufinus*, certainly caused by their connections with the Eastern Church. But they are a minority.

Oesterley points out, too, that the different opinions are reflected in the great LXX-manuscripts. *B*(Vaticanus) contains all the Apocrypha except the two books of the Maccabees. In this respect *A*(Alexandrinus) and *Venetus* are still more complete. *Sinaiticus*, which is now incomplete, certainly contained the Apocrypha. For it has 1-2 Macc., and as several canonical books are missing (Amos, Hosea, Micah and several others), the lack of other apocryphal books is certainly no sign of rejection, but it means that these parts of the manuscript are lost. Accordingly the tendency to reject the Apocrypha was not universal in the Eastern Church in the 4th century. This corresponds to the fact that the Syrian Church, the old translation of which (the Peshitta) did not contain the Apocrypha, in the 4th century added these books to the Canon. This tendency to accept the Apocrypha becomes dominant later in the history of the Eastern Church (the synod of Constantinople in Trullo 692 and Photius in the 9th century). At last a compromise was arranged in Jerusalem in 1672 (cf. above).

In the West the line from Jerome is continued at least to a certain degree by Gregory the Great. He rejected the books of the Maccabees and only would have them read for edification. Alcuin did not accept *Ecclus.*, and Walafried Strabo did not approve of *Baruch*. Similar views were held all through the Middle Ages by a series of scholars, e.g. Nicolaus de Lyra. But the Church in general (Thomas Aq., Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura) accepted the Apocrypha as a part of the Canon. The decision of the synod of Trent (cf. p. 38) is prepared e.g. in the synod at Florence and the bulla of Eugenius IV from 1442, even if these measures did not silence the opposition.

A practical survey of the position of the Roman Church is given by Dennefeld, *Histoire des livres de l'Ancien Testament* (1929), pp. 24-28. In Roman theology scholars often – after the example of Elias Levita – distinguish between the books acknowledged by all churches (the books of the Hebrew Canon) as "protocanonical", and the Apocrypha as "deutero-canonical"; but this does not mean that the latter are of minor authority (Dennefeld, p. 9). Roman theology consequently uses the word "apocryphal" of the books which in Evangelical theology are called "pseudepigrapha".

Some Oriental churches have preserved much more of this material. While the Canon of the Nestorians was shorter than the usual Canon (p. 40), a great many books have been preserved in Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic literature, especially of the apocalyptic kind. It is mostly such books which by an inappropriate title are called "*Pseudepigrapha*". They are found in rather large numbers, and several names of such books which are now only names show that there has been still more of this kind of literature in circulation<sup>1)</sup>.

Torrey, *The Apoc. Lit.*, pp. 7ff. holds an opinion related to that of Moore<sup>2)</sup> and denies a Semitic word as fundament for the term "apocryphal". The rabbis use the term "outside books" of acanonical writings. Torrey explains "apocryphal" from the ideas expressed in IV Ezra 12 and 14 (cf. p. 26). The Church believed that the "outside books" were divinely dictated, but not of so high rank as the 24 books. Torrey rejects the term "*Pseudepigrapha*" and replaces it by "*Apocrypha*".

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Steuernagel*, pp. 833-835 where several of these books are enumerated.

<sup>2)</sup> above, p. 21.

# THE TEXT

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The history of the Canon has led us to the conclusion that the greater churches generally have the same definition of the comprehension of the OT part of the Bible. Some accept a few books more, others omit a few books. But the common stock is the Palestinian Canon.

When we now proceed to examine the *history of the text* it is clear that we have to concentrate upon the *Hebrew-Aramaic text*. This is not only the consequence of the just mentioned result of our review of the history of the Canon; nor is it only a consequence of the fact that the author of the present Introduction belongs to the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Denmark; it follows simply from the historical fact that the Hebrew text is primary in relation e.g. to the Greek translations. Even if the Hebrew text had not been preserved at all, the aim of the history of the text had to be the history of the fundamental text which we had to assume behind the Greek text, just as we seek the Semitic original behind the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha where it must be considered lost.

For recent works on the history of the text, see the Appendix.

## THE OUTWARD FORM OF THE TEXT

### *The writing-materials.*

The history of text begins before the time of the manuscripts transmitted to our times. We have written documents in the OT going back into the 2nd millennium B.C., e.g. Judg. 5. From this time onwards the writings have their history of tradition which in most cases we cannot trace. We can say something of the *materials* used for this handing down in writing, and about the *dangers* threatening the books during that process.

How did people write in Ancient Israel?

The OT itself gives us some hints, and the *Oriental Cultural History* supplies us with a broader, explaining background.

The *Scribe* carries with him a sort of *pen-case* (Ez. 9,2ff.), made of wood,

containing one room for *reed-pens* and one for a sort of “*China-ink*” which was stirred up in water when he had to go into professional action.

In Jer. 17,1 the prophet speaks of the sin of Judah as written with an *iron pen* and graven upon the table of their hearts with a *point of a diamond*. These metaphors presuppose the use of very hard implements to inscribe writing on tables of some sort or other. From these expressions Procksch has concluded<sup>1)</sup> that Israel in ancient times used books of *wooden or clay tablets*, and that papyrus or parchment did not come into use till later. But Eissfeldt is probably right in maintaining that the prophetic word in question and similar expressions only prove that in Israel tables of hard material, and hard pointed pencils were used. We must be cautious and not press the evidence too stoutly in the service of archaology in a poetical text of this kind. On the contrary, the oldest certain evidence concerning writing-materials which we have in the OT, the record of Baruch's writing of the scroll of Jeremiah, tells us that the book at that time was made of weak material which could be burnt, and that the letters were written on this material with pen and ink (Jer. 36). Other words confirm this (Ez. 2,9–10; Is. 34,4). The *diptychon*, a double tablet of wood, has however been known.<sup>2)</sup>

Jer. 36,18 mentions the *ink*. In antiquity the ink seems to have been of the iron kind, or of the various combinations that could be made with carbon, copperas, oak galls, and gum<sup>3)</sup>. The same story shows that the text was written on the scroll in *columns* (v. 23). The *pen* must, when the material on which the writing is inscribed consists of weak stuff, probably have been the *reed-pen*. But the Hebrew words *‘et* and *heret* can also be used of the *stylus* with which the writing is inscribed on a table that is exhibited in public (Is. 8,1; Jer. 17,1). The passage in Jer. 17 uses a word, *šipporen*, originally meaning a nail, and consequently the point of the stylus<sup>4)</sup>.

The reed-pen was cut with a *pen-knife* (Jer. 36,32). The scribe carried his implements (ink-horn<sup>5)</sup> and pen) in his belt (Ez. 9,2). From the burning of the scroll of Jeremiah on the fire of king Jehoiakim the conclusion has been drawn that the scroll was made of papyrus: Burning leather (parchment) would stink so horribly that the king and his train would have had to leave the room! But Eissfeldt is probably right in saying that in a situation like that of Jer. 36 people

<sup>1)</sup> Procksch, Der hebräische Schreiber und sein Buch, in Kuhnert-Festschrift, quoted by Eissfeldt, p. 695.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. Galling, Biblisches Reallexikon, col. 464.

<sup>3)</sup> On the composition of ink, cf. the relevant paragraphs in Torczyner's edition of the Lachish Letters; cf. G. R. Driver, Semitic Writing (1948), p. 86.

<sup>4)</sup> On the *pen*, cf. G. R. Driver, op. cit., pp. 18 ff. <sup>5)</sup> cf. Driver, op. cit., p. 86.



do not pay attention to the olfactory organs! But papyrus nevertheless is the most probable material for book scrolls, for one thing because we know that this material played an important part in the trade of the Phoenicians, so that the town of *Gebal* in Greek is called *Byblos*, i. e. "the Papyrus-Town". The story of *Wen-Amon's* journey (ca. 1100 B. C.) tells us that 500 rolls of papyrus were sent to the prince of Byblos in return for a supply of timber. – The scrolls could be *washed* and the writing so obliterated (cf. Num. 5,23, and the verb *māhā* in the meaning "obliterate").<sup>1)</sup>

But we also have to reckon with the possibility that *skins* of animals were used in the old days as material for book rolls. The *Letter of Aristeas* (§ 176) says that the copy of the Law which was fetched in Jerusalem for the library at Alexandria was written on *parchment* (diphtera). From *Diodorus Siculus* (II, 32,4) we know that the *Persians* used animal skin (basilikai diphtérai)<sup>2)</sup>. Documents on *skin* and *leather* are mentioned in Egypt as early as the IV dynasty (ca. 2900—2650 B. C.) and specimens of such texts are known from the days of the XII dynasty (ca. 2000—1788 B. C.). Greek and Iranian documents on *parchment* have been found in Dura-Europos, dated in the last two centuries B. C. The NT uses the Latin word *membrana*, parchment (2 Tim. 4,13) and in this context mentions "other books" which are then probably rolls of papyrus<sup>3)</sup>. In *Hellenistic* times the wooden diptychon with *wax-tablets* appears<sup>4)</sup>.

The *roll* has been in use down to our times as the form obligatory for the copies of the books used in the synagogue. But in the 2th century A. D. we meet the "codex" (our form of "book") in use for private manuscripts. The *parchment-codex* appears for certain in the first part of the 4th century A. D. But the discoveries of papyri in Egypt have shown us another link in the development: here we find the *papyrus-codices*, probably a century earlier. In this respect the discovery of the *Chester-Beatty* papyrus-codices has had a great significance<sup>5)</sup>.

Besides this material *clay tablets* were used in older times as in Babylon. Such tablets have been found in rather great numbers in Palestine and Syria (The *Ras Shamra* Tablets, The Letters from *Taanach*, and other discoveries). The Egyptian *El Amarna* clay tablets with their Babylonian writing show how widespread the use of this material has been in the Ancient Near East. Further, for short messages, letters, receipts etc. potsherds, *ostraca*, were used, e. g. the *Samaritan Ostraca* from the time of the Omri-dynasty in Israel (ca. 860 B. C.),

<sup>1)</sup> cf. Cornill, Einleitung, p. 284.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien II, p. 343 f. Baumgartner, Theol. Rundschau 1951, pp. 136 and 153, the corrections of errors in Kahle's dating of parchment scrolls Baumgartner, loc. cit.

<sup>3)</sup> comp. the commentaries.

<sup>4)</sup> Galling, op. cit. – G. R. Driver, op. cit., pp. 14 ff., 81 f.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. the edition of F. G. Kenyon, The Chester-Beatty Biblical Papyri fasc. I. pp. 9 ff., supplemented by the Scheide Papyri, ed. by A. C. Johnson, Gehman, and Kase (1938).

and the *Lachish Letters* from the time of 587<sup>1</sup>). Greater *inscriptions* were of course carved in stone, but they are of more importance for the development of the forms of the letters. On the *ostraca* the words were written by means of the *reed-pen* and the usual *ink*, while the stone inscriptions of course had to be chiselled into the stone. The *cuneiform* letters are printed in the wet clay by means of a *stylus* which has altered its form in the course of time: it became broader and broader<sup>2</sup>).

### *The signs of the alphabet.*

The tablets from *El Amarna* in Egypt show that the Babylonian cuneiform script was in use in Palestine. This is corroborated by the *Taanach* tablets, found in Palestine proper, and like the *El Amarna* letters dating from ca. 1400 B.C. That this form of writing at an early date was simplified is proved by the *Ras Shamra* tablets from the 13th century B.C., where the cuneiform signs have been used to build up an *alphabetical* system of letters, each sign signifying a sound. The famous "Phoenician", *Old Semitic Alphabet*, is known from texts not only from the 9th century B.C., but after the discovery of an arrow-head with the name of 'Ada from the 13th century and the inscriptions of *Shaphatbaal* and *Ahiram* from Byblos perhaps also from dates coming near to the times assumed for the still enigmatic *Sinai-inscriptions* from *Serabit el-Hadem* (1850-1500)<sup>3</sup>).—This *Ancient Semitic Alphabet* was much used in Palestine, in Israelite times too. The *Abibaal-inscription* from ca. 900 which also comes from Phoenicia, and the *Moabite Stone* of *Mesha*, king of Moab, both belong to countries outside the boundaries of Israel, from Ahab's time. But from the same epoch come the *Samaritan Ostraca*, mentioned above, together with the so-called "*Farmer's Calendar*" from Gezer, and the somewhat younger texts: The *Siloam Inscription* from the days of Hezekiah (ca. 700 B.C.), and the important *Lachish Letters* from the last days of the kingdom of Judah, also mentioned above. *Aramaic* inscriptions as the *Kilamu* texts from *Zenjirli* and the *Zakir-inscription* from the environs of *Hamath* (7th century) show the use of this alphabet in Northern Syria. In Israel we find the same letters on many *seals*.

We are also able to determine how long this alphabet has been used by the

<sup>1</sup>) cf. the editions of *Torczyner* from 1938 (*Lachish I*) and (in Hebrew) 1940—both rather fantastic volumes, cf. *D. Winton Thomas* in *Journal of Theol. Studies* 1939, pp. 1ff. *Pal. Explor. Quarterly* 1946, p. 38f. "The Prophet" in the *Lachish Ostraca* (1946).

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Meissner*, loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *G. R. Driver*, op. cit., pp. 94 ff., 104 ff.—Cf. Appendix to pp. 42 ff.



Jews, at least approximately. It is found on *Maccabaeian coins*, nay, as late as on coins from the insurrection of *Bar Cocheba* against *Hadrian* ca. 130 A.D. Further the name of *Yahuweh* in some fragments of the Greek translation of the OT by *Aquila* is written in Old Semitic script<sup>1</sup>). And it has been preserved in the alphabet of the *Samaritans*, used to this day in a late form. The Phoenician alphabet accordingly has been in use in all the time which we regard as the history of Israel in Antiquity. It must be supposed behind Judg. 8,14, where a "boy" from *Succoth* takes down the names of the leading men in the city in a sort of proscription-list. It is however doubtful if we are allowed to use the word "boy", *na'ar*, as a basis for the assumption that knowledge of writing was widespread in Israel at that time. For the word can be used to signify an unfree officer of the king<sup>2</sup>). Is. 10,19 is therefore no certain parallel for the interpretation of Judg. 8,14<sup>3</sup>).

The Ancient Semitic alphabet has 22 signs for the consonants. The signs  $\Upsilon$  (י) and  $\Sigma$  (ז) were sometimes used to signify the vowels  $\bar{o}$ ,  $\bar{u}$ ,  $\bar{i}$ ,  $\bar{e}$ , and the  $\mathfrak{A}$  (ח) and  $\mathfrak{K}$  (ס) as signs for  $\bar{a}$ . It is evident that this may be a source of errors, many words being able to be read in more than one way. The separation of words was marked by vertical strokes or dots between the words, but not consistently; and the so-called *scriptio continua*, without any separation of words, was also used. This too means a source of errors. Moreover several letters in this alphabet are very similar to one another, so that mistakes of identity were very easy. We may with *Eissfeldt* draw attention to the likeness between  $\mathfrak{C}$  (ב) and  $\mathfrak{C}$  (י),  $\mathfrak{A}$  (ח) and  $\mathfrak{H}$  (ה),  $\mathfrak{W}$  (ז) and  $\mathfrak{Y}$  (ז).

But nowadays the Holy Scriptures are not written in the characters of the Old Semitic script. Its employment among the *Samaritans* shows that it must have been in use among the Jews when the schism between Samaritans and Jews took place (cf. p. 25). But the *Jews* have adopted another development of the old script, which they call the "square script" or, to distinguish it from the Old Semitic ("Hebrew"), the "*Assyrian*" script. That the first name is derived from the peculiar shape of the letters — now used in the Bibles — is clear. The second ("the *Assyrian*") is explained by the circumstance that this writing was developed from the Old Semitic in Northern Syria. How early the Jews began to use the square letters we do not know for certain. The letters from

<sup>1</sup>) The reading "*Yahu*" (*Yahweh*) on a coin from ca. 400 B.C. has not been justified, see *Journ. of the Palestine Oriental Soc.* 1934, pp. 178ff.; 1945, pp. 341ff. — Cf. p. 61, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup>) so in a *jar-stamp* from Tell bet-Mirsim and one from Bethshemesh, cf. *Galling, Bibl. Reallex.* col. 489.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. already *Gesenius-Buhl's lexicon*, stating that *na'ar* may be the same as *'ebed* in similar seals.



*Lachish* (ca. 587 B.C.) still exhibit the Old Semitic in daily use in correspondence between military leaders during the war with Nebuchadrezzar. And the oldest post-exilic, Jewish inscription in square writing, found in the ruins of *Araḥ el-Emīr* in Transjordanian comes from the times of the *Seleucids*, probably from 183 B.C. — The *Talmud*, Sanhedrin 21b, relates that *Ezra* introduced the Assyrian script in Holy Scripture. But like so many other traditions of this kind this is also quite unwarranted. With certainty we can say that the square letters were in common use in the Holy Books *before the time of Christ*. For the words Mt. 5, 18, that no *jot* shall pass from the Law till all be fulfilled, can only be understood on the assumption that the square writing is used: The big Old Semitic *Yodh* (𐤅) cannot be thought of this passage. It must be the smallest letter of the Assyrian script (𐤁) which is alluded to here. Moreover, *Johann Fischer*<sup>1)</sup> has probably shown that Greek translators of the Law and Isaiah seem to employ an original text which must have been written in Neo-Aramaic characters similar to the square writing.

One of the oldest manuscripts exhibiting the Assyrian square script is the *Nash Papyrus* from ca. 100 A.D. But this age is disputed<sup>2)</sup>.

Many Hebrew manuscripts have on the top of the letters some peculiar crown-like embellishments, the so-called *tagīm*.

In this form of alphabet, too, some of the letters give possibilities for *confusion*, e.g. 𐤅 and 𐤆, 𐤇 and 𐤈, 𐤉 and 𐤊. The original lack of signs for the *vowels*, the inconsistent *separation* of the words, and the *scriptio continua* also causes uncertainty.

The history of the signs for the vowels is examined later in connection with the later history of the tradition of the text.

*Literature:* Galling, *Biblisches Reallexikon*, cols. 460ff. *Bauer*, *Der Ursprung des Alphabets* (1937). *Torczyner*, *The Lachish Letters* (1938). The Hebrew edition from 1940, mentioned by *Winton Thomas* (cf. above) I have not seen. *Hempel*, *Die Ostraka von Lakiš* (ZATW 1938, pp. 126ff.). *Winton Thomas* (cf. p. 45, n. 1). *Lindblom*, *Zur Frage der Entstehung des Alphabets* (1932); *Der sogenannte Bauernkalender von Gezer* (1931); *Fornhebreiska inskrifter i Palestina, Syrien och Sinaiökn* (Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift 1931, pp. 17ff.); *Genom ökn* till Sinai (1930). *Jensen*, *Geschichte der Schrift* (1925), pp. 99–140. *Ronzewalle*, *Note sur le texte phénicien de la flèche publiée par M. P.-E. Guignes* (Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph, Beyrouth, 1926, pp. 239–358). Concerning the writing from *Ras Shamra*, see the literature mentioned by *Baumgartner*, *Theol. Rundschau* 1940, pp. 164–66. *G. R. Driver*, *Semitic Writing* (1948—The Schweich Lectures 1944).

*Editions:* *Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum* (CIS). *Lidzbarski*, *Handbuch der nordse-*

<sup>1)</sup> Das Alphabet der LXX-Vorlage im Pentateuch (1924); In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor? (1930).

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Appendix—on the Papyrus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

mitischen Epigraphik. Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions. *Diringer*, Le iscrizioni antichebraiche Palestinesi (1934). *Reifenberg*, Ancient Hebrew Seals (1948). *Hans Bauer*, Die alphabetischen Keilschrifttexte von Ras Schamra (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen... ed. by *Lietzmann*) (1936). Palestine Inscriptions, ed. by *Th. C. Vriezen* and *J. H. Hospers* (1951) — in the Series Textus Minores. On the Ras Shamra Texts: *Gordon*, Ugaritic Handbook, I–III (1946). Ugaritic Literature (1949); cf. also *Honigman* in the OT and Modern Study, pp. 264ff. To this and ff. §§ cf. Appendix to p. 47, l. 17.

*Divisions of the text.*

The division of the Canon in its three parts is mentioned earlier in this work. Here we shall examine the divisions of the text inside the separate books.

*Baba bathra* 13b, where the joining together of the books is discussed, demands an interval of 3 lines between the individual prophets in the Dodecapheton. Between the books of the Law and between the books of the Prophets there must be 4 lines, except in the case when the book comes to its end at the bottom of a column in the scroll. Then it is allowed to begin immediately at the top of the next column. Concerning the partition of Sam., Kings, Ezra–Neh., and Chron. we refer to the Special Introduction. Just as the division of these books into two (1 Sam., 2 Sam. etc.), after the example set by the Vulgate, for the first time appears in a Hebrew manuscript from 1448, so the *division into chapters* at this time enters the Jewish texts from the Vulgate. The Rabbinic Bible from 1516 gives the Christian numbers of chapters in the margin.

This division into chapters was introduced by *Stephen Langton* of Canterbury (ca. 1205). The *verses* are older. They were marked by the *massoretes*<sup>1</sup>). In the NT the division of the chapters into verses was arranged by the learned Parisian printer *Robert Stephanus*. It is told that he made it in 1551 when travelling from Paris to Lyons. Another arrangement was made by *Theodore Beza*, also for the NT.

Before the division into chapters was arranged by *Langton*, the *Jews* had their own division of the text into sections greater than the verses. At an early date the text was divided in the so-called *parashas*. These *parshiyyoth* are different from the liturgical *parshiyyoth* which will be mentioned later. Here we talk of a division according to the contents. This division was already known to the *Mishnah* where it is mentioned in connection with the Law<sup>2</sup>). The greater divisions were marked by the beginning of a new line, and if the previous division filled the whole of its last line, one line was left open between the sections. This form of *parasha* is called “open”, *p<sup>e</sup>tūḥā*, because the interval is only closed on one side. Smaller sections were indicated by a “closed”

· <sup>1</sup>) RGG, 2nd ed., III, col. 622–23.

<sup>2</sup>) *Steuernagel*, p. 40.—Cf. *G. R. Driver*, The Hebrew Scrolls... (p. 43), with ref. to Megillah IV, 4.



parasha, *ṣetūmā*, the interval being only a blank space in the line. If in the last case it was necessary to begin a new line, the interval was placed at the beginning of the new line. Later all these arrangements were simplified by leaving only an interval in the lines, marked by a  $\text{פ}$  if the parasha was originally "open", and with a  $\text{ס}$  if it was originally "closed".

The Jewish division into *verses* can be traced to *Mishnaic* times. The verse is in Hebrew called *pāsūk*. Tradition reports that the *Babylonian* and the *Palestinian* Jews had different divisions in this respect. Different sums of verses are given from the two Jewish centres. Traces of such different divisions are found in some OT passages which have a *double accentuation* (Gen. 35,22; the Decalogue). The accent *sōph pasūk* noting "the end of the verse" is a late phenomenon. To this day it must not be placed in scrolls used in the synagogue and it is not found in the oldest manuscripts.

The *numbering of the verses* appears for the first time in an edition of the Psalms by *Frobenius* in Basel from 1563, in the complete Bibles not until the edition of *Arias Montanus* (Antwerp 1571). There exists an edition of the Bible of *Luther* from the year 1568 which has division into verses. Luther himself did not use this, but another form of division.<sup>1)</sup>

Certain *poetical* sections (Ps., Prov., Job, which have their peculiar accentuation, further Ex. 14,2ff., Deut. 32,1ff., Judg. 5, 2 Sam. 22) have early been written in *stichoi*, not as continuous lines.

The *liturgical reading* on Sabbaths and other festivals caused *another division of the Law*. These liturgical sections were among the *Palestinian* Jews called *ṣedarim*. Among the *Babylonians* such liturgical sections were called *parashas* (different from those mentioned above, p. 48). The *number* of these liturgical sections was not the same among the *Palestinians* and the *Babylonians*. The former used 3 years to read the whole Law, the latter only one year. The *Palestinian sedarim* were forgotten in the Middle Ages, all parts of Judaism having accepted the *Babylonian* system of reading the Law. But the *Palestinian* manner was revived by *Jacob ben Chayyim* in 1525.

After the example of the Law *the whole OT was divided into sedarim*, of different size. The liturgical parashas taken over from the *Babylonian* Jews were marked in the margin or in the text of the manuscripts and later in the printed editions by means of some *catchword*, and at their end is written either three  $\text{פ}$ 's or three  $\text{ס}$ 's, if they coincide with the "open" or "closed" parashas of the kind first mentioned.

The sections of the *Prophets* to be read in combination with the liturgical parashas are called *ḥāṣṭārōth*, from *pṭr*, to take leave", because the reading of

<sup>1)</sup> RGG, 2nd ed., loc. cit.



the Prophets closes the service. Both forms of division can be conveniently studied in the work of rabbi *Hertz*, *The Pentateuch and Haftorahs*.

Evidence of *more primitive divisions* of the text we have in the NT, Rom. 11,2 and Mk. 12,26.

## THE MASSORETIC TEXT

### *The traditional view.*

The text found in modern editions of the OT is called the *Massoretic text*, often shortened MT or TM. This name comes from the Jewish learning, which calls the tradition of the text *msrt*. The pronunciation of this word is uncertain. *msrt* can be read *māsoreth*, cf. Ex. 20,37, contracted from *m'srt*, from 'sr, "to bind", meaning "obligation". But perhaps it should rather be derived from *msr*, which in Neo-Hebrew means "hand down", i.e. "tradition". The word should then be pointed either as the infinitive, *m<sup>e</sup>soreth*, or as a verbal noun, *massoreth*, cf. *kapporeth*. *msrh* is pronounced either *māsōrā* or *massōrā*. Some scholars think that it ought to be pronounced *m<sup>e</sup>sōrā*.<sup>1)</sup>

The traditional theory of the handing down of the text was that the text was already fixed in ancient times and since then presented to later generations with a singular faithfulness. This view in modern times is accounted for in the following manner.

Examinations of a great many manuscripts and early prints which at the end of the 18th century were undertaken by *Kennicott* and *de Rossi* have shown that there are *no real variants*, setting aside errors of copyists and orthographical differences. From this it was inferred that *all manuscripts were derived from one single manuscript*. This is the so-called "*theory of the archetype*", propounded in the preface by *Rosenmüller* to an edition of the OT from 1834, further in the *Biblische Abhandlungen* of *Sommer* (1864), p. 79, in *Olshausen's* commentary on the Psalms (1853), p. 17f., and above all in *Paul de Lagarde's* *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien* (1863), p. 1f.<sup>2)</sup> This theory was thought to be confirmed by the fact that the manuscripts are like one another in quite external trivial matters such as peculiar forms of single letters. Sometimes there are letters greater or smaller than the rest, cf. also the so-called *litterae suspensae*. Most importance was however attached to the work of the massoretes, apparently so exact and uniform.

The archetype, it is thought, was fixed ca. 100 A.D. This opinion is founded on the observation that the *Talmudic* literature in its quotations of the Bible

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Steuernagel*, p. 19. *Bauer and Leander*, *Hist. Gram.* (1918), p. 71f.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. the review by *Steuernagel*, p. 20, and *Oesterley and Robinson*, *Introduction to the Books of the OT* (1935), pp. 13ff.—On recent literature: *Winton Thomas*, in *The OT and Modern Study*, pp. 239ff.

presupposes our text, and that the *translations* from the 2nd century A.D. (*Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion*) witness to the Massoretic text. Finally, the theory is supported by *Jewish traditions* concerning work of *textual criticism* in 3 copies of the Torah in the temple at Jerusalem which exhibited some differences from one another. In the *Talmud of Jerusalem*, Ta'anith IV, 2 it is related that in order to settle the right text the reading represented by 2 of the manuscripts was always preferred to that found only in one of them. This should prove that already before 70 A.D. the text had been critically fixed. Another tradition says that after the catastrophe of 70 A.D. the priests saved a copy of the Torah and brought it to the fortress *Bittir*. When *Hadrian* conquered this fortress in 135 A.D. members of the House of David brought the scroll to *Bagdad*, and from there copies were sent to the different congregations. Similar theories also circulate concerning the other books. These stories may contain the truth that after the fall of the Holy City some temple texts were saved and made the fundament of the revision of the many existing texts<sup>1</sup>).

The theory of the archetype cannot be upheld. A more complete study of old manuscripts by *Ginsburg*, but above all by *Paul Kahle* and his pupils, especially the discoveries of old manuscripts such as those from the Genizah of Old Cairo, have shown that the assumed uniformity of the tradition in fact is great, greater than usual in the textual tradition of literature from Antiquity. But nevertheless there is a *greater bulk of variants* than assumed after the works of *Kennicott* and *de Rossi*. There are *different schools of massoretes* not always in accord with one another concerning the punctuation and not even concerning the consonants. *Aquila*, the most accurate of the old versions, presents a variant in every second verse<sup>2</sup>). The harmony between the quotations in the *Talmud* and the Massoretic text is perhaps the result of later conformation, and *Strack*<sup>3</sup>) and *Aptowitzer*<sup>4</sup>) have pointed out passages in the *Talmud* where the quotations of the Bible do not correspond to the Massoretic text. Even old *prints*, as the edition of the Psalms from 1477, contain differences from the text now assumed<sup>5</sup>). The result is that also *the theory of an "Urtext" is becoming uncertain*. The text existed from the beginning in several forms.

*Literature:* *Steuernagel*, pp. 19ff. *Lagarde*, *Materialien zur Kritik des Pentateuchs I* (1867), p. XII. *Kennicott*, *Vetus Testamentum Hebr. cum variis lectionibus* (1776 and 1780). *De Rossi*, *Variae lectiones Veteris Testamenti* (1784-88).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Kahle*, in the *Nötscher-Festschrift* (1950), p. 131.

<sup>2</sup>) *Steuernagel*, p. 21. See also the material mentioned by *Oesterley and Robinson*, op. cit. p. 14.

<sup>3</sup>) *Prolegomena critica in Vetus Testamentum* (1873), pp. 94ff.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. below, p. 58.

<sup>5</sup>) proved by *Ginsburg* in his *Introduction to the massoretico-critical edition of the Hebrew Bible* (1897), pp. 791ff.—In a Geniza-fragment of 2 Chron. 25,5 we find a whole verse generally not found in our Bibles (*Kahle*, *Die hebr. Handschriften aus der Höhle*, p. 27.—cf. the *Appendix* to p. 95).



### The Massoretes.

The work of the massoretes is a consequence of the canonization of the texts ca. 100 A.D. This leads to the result that the books had to be handed down exactly in the form they had. No errors must be allowed to creep in, and errors which have crept in must be expurgated. This work was already begun by the old rabbis. In *Pirke Aboth* III,4 is recorded the word of Akiba: *massoreth s'jag lattōra*, "tradition: a fence round the Law!"<sup>1</sup>). In later times special schools of massoretes develop. They had the task to *preserve the consonant text and assure that it was pronounced in the right manner*, i.e. to take care of the right writing of the manuscripts. To control this they developed a scientific system of statistics concerning the text. They count the number of verses, nay, even of words and letters. They mark the middle of the books etc. It is settled how often a word occurs, both in a single book and in the whole Bible. Special forms and the number of their occurrences are noted, together with peculiarities in writing etc. Like all Oriental tradition this material has originally been handed down orally, but by and by it is fixed in writing, and so we get the *Massoretic notes* in the manuscripts, some in the margins beside the text (*massora parva*), some, in more elaborate form, on the top and the bottom of the pages (*massora magna*), and some at the end of the books and the whole Bible in alphabetic dictionary-form (*massora finalis*). *Massora parva* and *magna* are also called *massora marginalis*, as different from the *massora finalis*. How it looked can to some extent be seen in the 3rd edition of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, where the *massora parva* is printed in the margins. The rest of the material, the *massora magna* and *finalis*, was ready for printing, when the editor, Paul Kahle, had to leave Nazi-Germany in 1939<sup>2</sup>).

We know that there have existed different *Massoretic schools*. After the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., and above all after the insurrection of Bar Cocheba in 132–35 the centre of Judaism and its learning was transferred to *Babylonia*. Here, from the 3rd to the 9th century, the schools at the towns of *Nehardea* and *Sura* flourished, in *Nehardea* only till the devastation of the town in the 3rd century. "The Eastern Massoretes", *mādinhā'ē*, later got their *Western* counterparts in the schools of *Tiberias* in Palestine, "the Western Massoretes", *m<sup>a</sup>rbā'ē*, which during the 8th and 9th centuries developed a lively activity.

About these schools we had for a long time very little reliable information.

<sup>1</sup>) "Tradition" is here both the traditional writing and the traditional interpretation (see D. Hoffmann in the Mishna—edition of Berlin 1924). According to Strack, in his edition of P. Ab. 1915, the former meaning is of later date. — In Strack's edition the passage stands III, 13b.—Concerning Akiba's theory of literal inspiration, see below, p. 77.

<sup>2</sup>) Kahle, Schweich Lectures 1941, p. 74, n. 1.



It is the discoveries of recent decades, the untiring work of one man, *Paul Kahle*, which has given us a clearer picture of the activity of these men and their work. The uncertainty was above all caused by the *corruption of the Massoretic tradition*. The marginal notes in later manuscripts had degenerated into mere ornaments, the meaning of which was no longer understood<sup>1</sup>). The Massora was not handed down with the same care as the text to which it was to be "a fence". Old manuscripts with uncorrupted Massora in margins and at the end were rare, because the Jews had the custom to hide age-worn manuscripts in the lumber-rooms (*genizoth*) of the synagogues, in order that the worn places should not cause misreadings in the service. And when the *geniza* was packed, a clearing away was arranged, during which the old venerable manuscripts were solemnly *buried*. In *Old Cairo*, however, by good luck the *geniza* had not been cleared, but walled up and forgotten. As it was rediscovered in 1890 still more luck happened: The contents were not buried, but sold or given away. A great part of the manuscripts found their way into our libraries. The most famous collection is the *Taylor-Schechter-collection* in the University Library of Cambridge.<sup>2</sup>) *Paul Kahle* has with untiring zeal combed the libraries of Europe and America and has gained a vast and intimate knowledge of this material and other material of the same kind e.g. in the *Russian* collections, and so he has been able to give us a picture of the work of the massoretes in East and West, in Babylonia and Palestine.

First he has been able to prove that the two centres of Jewish learning each had their *system of punctuation*, or rather: in both countries we find *two* systems, a more primitive, simple form, and a later, more developed "complicated" form (cf. below p. 64). More important still is his demonstration that the *Babylonian schools* in several cases had *another text* and *other grammatical forms* than the *Palestinians*. This means, that a *grammar* of the Hebrew language founded on the Eastern Massora would be somewhat different from the usual which is founded upon the *Palestinian* tradition of vocalisation. Finally he has been able to restore the notes of the massoretes. When *Jacob ben Chayyim* in 1524-25 published the so-called "second Rabbinical Bible" through the press of *Daniel Bomberg* in Venice he also collected the Massora. But he had only late and mediocre manuscripts at his disposal. He says that the tradition of the massoretes was greatly confused: alluding to Ex. 12,30 he describes the situation by saying that "there was not a house in which there was not one dead"<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) *Kahle*, op. cit. pp. 70ff.

<sup>2</sup>) For the history of the discovery, see *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 1ff.

<sup>3</sup>) see the quotation of *Kahle*, *Masoreten des Ostens* (1913), p. VIII, and the description of *Jacob ben Chayyim's* work, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 71.

The reconstructions of *Jacob ben Chayyim*<sup>1)</sup> were in the course of time supplemented by several scholars, above all by *Ginsburg*. But the studies of *Kahle* have been the first really to disperse the mists from this domain. He has clearly worked out the characteristics of the schools. And he has taken practical steps towards the *edition of the Massora* of one of the schools, the work of the Tiberian massorete *Ben Asher*: In the 3rd edition of *Kittel's Biblia Hebraica* the *massora parva* of this school is published for the first time, printed in the outer margins, while *magna* and *finalis* should have been printed in a separate volume. As noted above it was ready for printing when *Kahle* had to go to England in March 1939. It is to be hoped that this important work will only have been delayed by the war.

*Kahle* has cleared up the tradition in one of the important Tiberian schools of punctators, the main representative of which is *Mose ben Asher*. His *codex of the Prophets* from the year 895 A.D. is preserved in the synagogue of the Qaraites in *Cairo*. Under the siglum C it has been used in the apparatus of the *Biblia Hebraica*, but it has appeared to be no characteristic *Ben Asher* manuscript. <sup>2)</sup> The son of *Mose ben Asher*, *Aaron ben Mose ben Asher* went his own ways and arranged the punctuation to an entire Bible manuscript, now preserved in the *Sephardian* synagogue of *Aleppo*. It is now ca. 1000 years old<sup>3)</sup>. *Kahle* was not able to use this manuscripts for his edition, because the Jews in *Aleppo* would not allow the sacred scroll to be submitted to photography. But luckily enough there exists a manuscript, formerly supposed to be an accurate copy of the *Aleppo-codex*, in the Public (formerly Imperial) Library of *Leningrad*, written in the year 1008 A.D. In the apparatus criticus of the *Biblia Hebraica* it is called *L*. But this codex *Kahle* now thinks is really *the best Ben Asher text*, independent of the *Aleppo-codex*. but derived from another *Ben Asher* manuscript.<sup>4)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> about which see *Kahle* in *Bauer and Leander*, *Historische Grammatik der Hebr. Sprache*, pp. 86ff.

<sup>2)</sup> *Kahle*, in the preface to the *Biblia Hebraica*, p. VIII. – On the *family of Ben Asher*: *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 55. For the history of the manuscript, cf. op. cit. p. 56f. cf. p. 68.; pp. 110ff. *Kahle* prints the colophons of the manuscript.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Kahle*, op. cit., pp. 55ff.; p. 59 he dates the manuscript to the year 929 A.D. This applies to the consonantal text, written by *Shelomo ben Buya'a*.

<sup>4)</sup> *Kahle* in the preface to the *Biblia Hebraica*, cf. *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 60ff. On the *Aleppo manuscript*, see also *Kahle*, *Masoreten des Westens I* (1927), pp. 1ff., but also the passage of the *Biblia Hebr.*, quoted above, and the *Schweich Lectures* 1941. – Concerning the doubts with regard to the *authenticity of the two Ben Asher codices* by *Wickes* and *Lagarde*, see *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 62ff. *Teicher*, *Journ. of Jew. Stud.* 1950, pp. 17ff., doubts the theory of *Kahle*, who answers in *Vetus Testamentum* 1951, pp. 161ff. Cf. also *The OT and Modern Study*, ed. *Rowley* (1951), p. 247, n. 3 (*Winton Thomas*).



The other Tiberian family of punctators, *Ben Naphtali*, has also been studied by *Kahle*. It is represented in European libraries by the so-called *Reuchlin-codex*, preserved in Karlsruhe. It was written in 1105 A.D. But *Kahle* has published several new texts illuminating the opinions of this school and proving that besides differences in the pronunciation it had developed the means of differentiating it, and the use of the accent of *meteg*<sup>1</sup>). About 1300 A.D. we can perceive the beginnings of a *compromise* between the Ben Asher and the Ben Naphtali-texts<sup>2</sup>).

The *Qaraites* are a Jewish sect, founded by *Anan ben David* ca. 750. They reject the Talmud and only acknowledge the OT as their religious foundation: hence they call themselves *b'ne mikrā* or *kārā'im*. *Sephardian* is a signification of the *Spanish* and *Portuguese* Jews. The *Polish* Jews are called *Ashkenazian*. The difference between the two parties is e.g. expressed in their different pronunciation of the Hebrew vowels, especially of the *gemes*. The punctuators are in Hebrew called *nakdānīm*, the punctuation *nikkūḏ*.

*Literature*: Before Jacob ben Chayyim: *Felix Pratensis*, also in the press of *Daniel Bomberg*, had published the so-called "*First Rabbinical Bible*" with Massoretic material (1516-18). Other important older works are: *Elias Levita* (cf. p. 27): Massoreth-ha-massoreth (Venice 1538 and Basle 1539); German translation by C. G. Meyer, ed. by Semler (1772); Hebrew text with English translation and commentary by Ginsburg (1867). *J. Buxtorf*, *Tiberias, seu commentarius massorethicus triplex* (1620). *Frenssdorff*, *Massorethisches Wörterbuch* (1876). *Ginsburg*, *Introduction to the massoretico-critical edition of the Hebrew Bible* (1897).

The main works of *Kahle* on this subject are: *Der masoretische Text des Alten Testaments nach der Überlieferung der babylonischen Juden* (1902). *Masoreten des Ostens* (1913). *Masoreten des Westens* I (1927), II (1930). *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes* (in *Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken* 1915, pp. 399-439). §§ 6-9 in *Bauer und Leander*, *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache* (1918-1922). *Die hebräischen Bibelhandschriften aus Babylonien* (ZATW 1928, pp. 118-37, and tables 1-90). *Der alttestamentliche Bibeltext* (*Theol. Rundschau* 1933, pp. 227-38). Preface III to *Biblia Hebraica*, ed. by *Rudolf Kittel*, completed by *Alt* and *Eissfeldt*, with *Kahle* as editor of the Massoretic material. *Index codicum Veteris Testamenti Babylonicorum* *ibid.* p. XXX-XXXIII. In his *Schweich Lectures* 1941, he has given an important survey of his life-work in this field, including the Jewish liturgical poetry of the early Middle Ages and the problems concerning the ancient translations of the Bible. But it is not only a survey of past work. The book also contains an abundance of new important ideas. Through the kindness of the author I have been able to see the proofs and use them for the present edition of my *Introduction*.—The Hebrew Ben Asher Bible Manuscripts, *Vetus Testamentum* 1951, pp. 101ff., against *Teicher*, *Journ. of Jew. Studies*, 1950, pp. 17ff., cf. *Vetus Test.* 1951, pp. 125ff.

<sup>1</sup>) On the controversy over the laws for the use of the *meteg*, see *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 64, where *Bergsträsser* is reported to have called his own treatment of this problem in his new edition of *Kautzsch's* Hebrew grammar "*Makulatur*". Cf. also *Kahle*, *op. cit.* p. 61, on the treatment of the problem in the *Biblia Hebraica*.

<sup>2</sup>) *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 69.



*The work of the Massoretes.*

According to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs we have to abandon the theory of the archetype as the explanation of the oldest textual history of the OT Hebrew text. The many fragments of old manuscripts, above all those from the Geniza of Old Cairo, and many other circumstances prove that the present uniformity of the text is a result of a selective activity among the Jews. Before the present uniformity was a reality we have had a great *variety of manuscripts and forms of the text*. The truth of the archetype theory is that the uniformity seems to begin to assert itself from ca. 100 A.D. The translations of the 2nd century A.D., *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion* prove that the text then attained approximately the same form as it exhibits in our days. But *Eissfeldt*<sup>1)</sup> rightly adds: "Certainly only approximately". Even the very exact *Aquila* shows variants in every second verse. And *Aptowitzer* has proved that down till the 8th, 10th, and even the 12th century we find *Bible quotations in the Rabbinic literature, deviating from our consonantal text*, accordingly taken from manuscripts with different readings. Many other instances point to the same fact. The different forms of the Books of Kings or Jeremiah in the Hebrew text and the Greek translation commonly called the LXX give evidence of the fact that the OT texts varied very much in earlier periods. *Kahle*, in his *Schweich Lectures 1941*, mentions the difference of New Testament quotations from the OT over against the Hebrew text, and the LXX, as it is known to us, e.g. in the speech of Stephen in Acts. 7 and in the Epistle to the Hebrews 9,3ff.<sup>2)</sup> Before the uniformity of the OT text lies a period of great multiplicity of textual forms – materially of course of the same contents, but like the New Testament material with many variants.

*The uniformity is the result of the work of the massoretes.* It goes so far that it is demanded that some letters must be written bigger than others (*litterae majusculae*, e. g. Gen. 1,1; Ex. 34,15; Lev. 11,42; 13,33; Deut. 6,4), marking the beginning of books, or the middlemost letter of a verse or a book, or some important sentence. In other places we find *litterae minusculae*, e. g. Gen. 2,4; Lev. 1,1, or *litterae suspensae*, e. g. Judg. 18,30 (here perhaps intended to alter the famous name of *Moses* to *Manasseh* in this scandalous text); Ps. 80,14; Job 38,13,15. Num. 25,12 a "crippled waw" is preserved in some manuscripts, perhaps to indicate a different reading, cf. the "closed *mēm*" in Is. 9,6, about which the legend reported that it had "closed itself" for grief that Hezekiah did not turn out the expected Messiah, but which is better explained through another reading (cf. the commentaries).

<sup>1)</sup> p. 701. – The same holds good of the "Dead Sea Scrolls", cf. *Kahle*, *Die hebr. Handschriften aus der Höhle*, pp. 25ff.

<sup>2)</sup> pp. 144f., 146f.

out the expected Messiah, but which is better explained through another reading (cf. the commentaries).

The massoretes have also drawn up *lists of variants*. They have been printed in Baer's separate editions of the books, but the work of Baer is very unreliable<sup>1</sup>). The Babylonian manuscripts prove the existence of much greater amount of difference between East and West. A lot of similar variants have been collected by Ginsburg in his editions. The massoretes have also preserved traditions of critical work on the text by the scribes. At about 20 places the traditional reading is called a "*tiḳḱun sōfērīm*", a "correction by the scribes". The expression *sēbīr*, "it is to be assumed", is also used where a reading is proclaimed erroneous or where another meaning is to be assumed<sup>2</sup>). The best known is Gen. 18,30 where the original text: "Yahweh remained standing before Abraham" is altered to: "Abraham remained standing before Yahweh," because "to stand before another" may be rendered "to serve", which was felt to be a blasphemy<sup>3</sup>). Doubts concerning the correct reading were expressed by means of "*puncta extraordinaria*" above single letters or entire words. A critical sign is presumably also the "*nun inversum*", which according to the *Talmud*, Shabbath 115b-116a indicates that Num. 10,35 is to be counted as a special book of the Law, or that verses are not in their proper place, cf. Ps. 107. Important is the indication of difference between the *kētib* and the *kere*.

But the most important work of the massoretes is certainly their invention of the *systems of the vowel marks and accents* (*niḳḱud* and *nēgīna*) in order to secure the correct pronunciation and the right diction in the reading of the text in the service. This work will be described in connection with the manuscripts.

*Literature:* Important Massoretic works, now mostly of historical interest: *Dikḏūḱē ha-ṭē-āmīm* (on the accents), ed. by Baer and Strack, is said to be a work of Aaron ben Mose ben Asher (cf. p. 54); but Kahle (in the Grammar of Bauer and Leander, p. 87) is very sceptical concerning this idea. Besides, the work of Baer and Strack is, here too (cf. above), quite unreliable, Kahle, Schweich Lectures 1941, pp. 64ff. — *Mose hanakdan*: *Darkē hanikkūd wēha-neginōt* (on the vocalisation and the accents), ed by Frenssdorff (1864), cf. Kahle, Schweich Lectures, p. 75, n. 7. — A similar work, not published, is found in the University Library at Halle, cf. Hupfeld, ZDMG 1867, pp. 201ff. — *Rabbi Me'ir (Abulafia) ha-Levi ben Todros* (from Toledo, d. 1244 A.D.): Massoret sējāg la-tōrā (cf. the saying of Akiba, p. 52), printed in Florence 1750 and Berlin 1861. — A commentary on the entire Bible by *rabbi Salomo Jedidia mi-Norzi* (from Nurcia), written in 1626, printed in

<sup>1</sup>) cf. Kahle, Schweich Lectures 1941, pp. 63ff., where Baer and Heidenheim are described as the last of the massoretes! Note especially the quotation on p. 63f., from a letter of Dr. Simonsen.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. Steuernagel, p. 34. The existing *tiḳḱune sōfērīm* are enumerated p. 32.

<sup>3</sup>) But cf. Mt. 20,28.



a Bible from Mantova 1742-44 under the title *minḥat šay*; separate edition Vienna 1813; reprinted in later Rabbinical Bibles, e.g. Warsaw 1860-66.

*Aptowitzer*: Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur (Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie (1906), no VI, pp. 3ff.; (1908); Jahresbericht der israel.-theol. Lehranstalt in Wien (1911)).

*Ginsburg's* collections, The Massorah, compiled from manuscripts I-IV (1880-1905), not finished, is a vast, but quite uncritical compilation, cf. *Kahle*, Schweich Lectures 1941, p. 43, and Masoreten des Ostens (1913), p. XIV.

Conc. the *Dead Sea Scrolls*, cf. the *Appendix* to p. 47.

*Hebrew witnesses of the text.*

### Printed editions.

The printed editions are of importance for the textual history, because the earliest of them are founded on manuscripts which now have disappeared, and so are *witnesses to lost manuscripts*.

The earliest prints do not contain the entire Bible: *The Psalms* (Bologna 1477; unknown place: 1478 and 1480); the *Pentateuch* (Bologna 1482; Faro 1487); *Megilloth* (Bologna 1482); the *Prophets* (Soncino 1485-86); the *Hagiographa* (Naples 1486-87).

The first complete Bible to be printed was published 1488 in *Soncino*, the second 1491-93 in *Naples*, the third, important as the basis of *Luther's* translation, in 1494 in *Brescia*. *Luther's* copy was preserved in the State Library of Berlin.

A series of compendious editions, mostly resting on the Soncino edition, appear between 1516 and 1528 in the firm of *Daniel Bomberg* in Venice. The Italian printers have the greatest merit for the first printings of the OT.

Importance for textual criticism must further be attached to the so-called *Rabbinical Bibles*. They contain, besides the Massoretic text, in parallel columns the *Targums*, also important witnesses to the text (cf. pp. 68ff.), and in the margins *rabbinical commentaries*. The first edition of this kind was given by the Jewish scholar *Felix Pratensis*<sup>1)</sup>, and printed by *Daniel Bomberg*<sup>2)</sup> in Venice 1516-17. For the first time it exhibits the official *kere* in the margin, it further contained the Targum Jerushalmi and Targum II to Esther (cf. p. 70-71), and the *Dikduke ha-ṭ-ʿamīm* (cf. p. 57). Another famous edition was prepared by *Jacob ben Chayyim*<sup>3)</sup>, also in the firm of *Bomberg*, in 1524-25. As mentioned above, *Jacob ben Chayyim* is the first to attempt to compile the *Massora* from manuscripts. He also tried to present a Bible text, revised according to the *Massora*. His text becomes fundamental for the following Rabbinical Bibles. These editions rest

<sup>1)</sup> *Kahle*, Schweich Lectures 1941, p. 69, n. 3.

<sup>2)</sup> *Kahle*, op. cit. p. 69, n. 2.

<sup>3)</sup> *Kahle*, op. cit. p. 70. — Jacob was a Jew converted to Christianity.



on manuscripts representing the compromise between the *Ben Asher* and the *Ben Naphtali* tradition<sup>1</sup>). *J. Buxtorf* in 1611 published a compendious edition and in 1618–19 a Rabbinical Bible in Basle. But he also used the text of the *Complutensian Polyglot* (cf. below), and his *punctuation of the Targums* has been constructed by himself after the pattern of Biblical Aramaic and is therefore without value as source for the Jewish pronunciation. Later Rabbinical Bibles were that of *Moses* from Amsterdam 1724–27 and a Warsaw edition from 1860–66.

A sort of development of the Rabbinical Bibles might be seen in the so-called *Polyglots*. The Rabbinical Bibles contained the Aramaic translations (the *Targums*). The Polyglots go further in this direction, including also other translations. But this development did not really take place, for the oldest printed Polyglot is older than the oldest printed Rabbinical Bible.

The oldest Polyglot is the just mentioned *Complutensian Polyglot*, edited under the supervision of cardinal *F. Ximenes* 1514–17 in Alcalà (the Roman *Complutum*) in Spain. It contains the Massoretic text in an independent revision, the Targum Onkelos (cf. p. 69f.), a LXX text according to Lucian manuscripts (cf. p. 79f.), and the Vulgate and a Greek-Latin dictionary. Greater is the *Antwerp-Polyglot* (1569–72), also called *Plantiniana* after the printer *Plantin*. The cost of its publication was defrayed by *Philip II* of Spain, and the edition is therefore also called *Biblia Regia*. The scientific director of the work was the theologian *Arias Montanus*. It contains the Massoretic text, Greek and Latin translations, Targums to nearly all the books, and dictionaries and archaeological treatises. Still more extensive is the *Paris-Polyglot* (1629–45), containing the Massoretic text and the LXX, the Samaritan text of the Law (cf. pp. 66ff.) with a Latin translation, the Vulgate, the Samaritan Targum (cf. p. 67), the Syriac translation (*Peshitta*, cf. pp. 72ff.), and the Arabic translation (cf. p. 72) with Latin translation. The greatest and scientifically most useful is the *London-Polyglot* from 1654–57. It was edited by *Brian Walton* and *Castellus*. It contains all the material of the Paris Polyglot and also fragments of the *Vetus Latina* (cf. p. 86f.), parts of the Ethiopic and Persian translations with Latin renderings, several important treatises, in parts an apparatus criticus, and a lexicon heptaglotton by *E. Castellus*, professor of Arabic in Cambridge, which was published in 1669. All the Polyglots also contain the New Testament

Of less importance are the Polyglots edited in Germany by *Elias Hutten* (The Hamburg-Polyglot 1587ff, and the Nuremberg-Polyglot 1599ff.). From the 19th century comes the Bielefeld-Polyglot (Hebr. Gr. Lat. German) by *R. Stier* and *K. G. W. Theile* (1864–55).

<sup>1</sup>) *Kahle*, op. cit. p. 69.

These works are the foundation of *later editions of the text*. By and by a *textus receptus* was formed, represented by the so-called *Bible of Athias*, named after the publisher *Jos. Athias* in Amsterdam. This edition is prefaced by *Joh. Leusden* and appeared in 1661 and 1667. It was followed by the edition of *van der Hooght* (Amsterdam and Utrecht 1705) and the editions of *Hahn* (Leipzig 1831 and later editions), and the older editions of the *British and Foreign Bible Society*.

The beginnings of a *critical revision* of this text are found in the editions of *Jablonski* (Berlin 1699) and *J. H. Michaëlis* (Halle 1720), perhaps also in the edition of *Opitz* (Kiel 1712) and *Salomo Jedidia mi-Norzi* (Mantua 1742-44, cf. p. 57); further in *Kennicott's* revision of the Athias Bible—with apparatus criticus of variants according to manuscripts (1776-80, cf. p. 51). *Baer and Delitzsch* have published separate editions of the Biblical books except Ex.-Deut., founded on manuscripts, information from massoretes, sayings of rabbis as the works of *Kimchi*; but these editions must be used very cautiously, their critical principles not being unimpeachable<sup>1</sup>).

A fresh start was made by *Ginsburg* and after him by *Rudolf Kittel*, both based on the edition of *ben Chayyim*. *Ginsburg* has with untiring eagerness collected variants and studied Massora. His first edition appeared in 1894, published by the *Trinitarian Bible Society*, with an Introduction to the massoretic-critical edition of the Hebrew Bible (1897). A stereotyped edition appeared in 1906. A later, beautiful work is the edition, furnished with a vast apparatus of variants, and the great monument to the collector-industriousness of *Ginsburg*, finished in 1926, after his death, by the *British and Foreign Bible Society*. But it is, in spite of all variants, only a reproduction of *ben Chayyim*.<sup>2</sup>)

The third edition of *Kittel's* *Biblia Hebraica* marks the real new beginning in the editing of the OT text. Its first volume was finished after *Kittel's* death by *Alt* and *Eissfeldt*, with *Kahle* as editor of the Massoretic text and commentary (1937). The volume containing the massora magna and finalis is still wanting (cf. p. 54). For the first time since the Reformation a manuscript is made the basis of an edition, and *Jacob ben Chayyim* is left aside. It is an edition of the *Ben Asher* text and Massora, 600 years older than *ben Chayyim*.

### Manuscripts.

The last lines have brought us to the material which is indispensable if we are to get a really scientifically reliable text: the manuscripts. They are at hand in a comparatively large number, but they are not very old. This is due to the

<sup>1</sup>) *Steuernagel*, p. 30, cf. *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 63ff.

<sup>2</sup>) *Kahle*, op. cit., pp. 72ff., 76ff.



inclination of the Jews to put aside old and worn copies and conceal and finally bury, i.e. annihilate them (cf. p. 53).

One of the oldest manuscripts is the so-called *Papyrus Nash* (cf. p. 47), but it is no real manuscript of the Bible, rather a liturgical piece. It contains the Decalogue and the beginning of the Shema<sup>1</sup>). The real Bible manuscripts are of two kinds: a) *Synagogue Scrolls*, written on parchment or leather, made of the skins of clean animals, often without vowel-points; b) *Codices* on parchment or paper, nearly always with vowel-points, but often not pointed by the original scribe. Not all manuscripts contain Massoretic notes. Some give also a *Targum*, the translation into Aramaic, first one verse in Hebrew, then one in Aramaic.

The manuscripts often contain notes giving information of the scribe who has written them, mostly in a so-called *colophon* at the end of the text. These colophons are sometimes forgeries. An especially dangerous falsificator was *A. Firkowitch*, who has forged the colophons of some manuscripts from the Crimea, and made "corrections" in genuine colophons to make believe that the manuscripts are older than they in reality are. But his forgeries can be comparatively easily detected, so that his indubitable merits as a great collector and discoverer of valuable manuscripts can be valued as they deserve<sup>2</sup>). He has e.g. discovered the very important "Prophet-Codex of Petersburg" from the year 916 A.D.

The manuscripts must be written in the *square* ("Assyrian") characters. The old Semitic script (cf. p. 46f.) went out of use at an early date. The *Mishnah*, Yadaim IV, 5, establishes that only books written in the "Assyrian" script, with ink, on parchment, "defile the hands", not pieces of writing in "Hebrew", i.e. Old Semitic letters<sup>3</sup>). *German* manuscripts generally exhibit rather angular letters, while *Spanish* and *Oriental* show a more rounded ductus. In late manuscripts we find the so-called *tāgīm* (cf. p. 47). Originally they were used in scrolls of the Law which therefore had them at a somewhat earlier time than other specimens. Some letters have peculiar shapes (cf. p. 56).

*Separation of words* is now generally consistently used. But the manuscripts do not always divide words in the same ways, just as there is not always consistency in the application of *vowel-signs* and the *scriptio plena* or *defectiva*. And – as mentioned above (p. 56f) – there are different critical notes and signs in the texts. – Each line had to end with a complete word. This involved different measures to fill the lines<sup>4</sup>) – e.g. abnormal broad letters.

Finally it must be noted that Hellenistic Judaism possessed Manuscripts in Hebrew written with Greek letters<sup>5</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Steuernagel*, p. 28.

<sup>2</sup>) *Kahle*, *Masoreten des Westens I* (1927), pp. 2, 56 ff., cf. *Schweich Lectures* 1941.

<sup>3</sup>) This proves the existence of manuscripts in the earlier form of writing from the time of the Mishna.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. *Eissfeldt*, in *Vetus Testamentum* 1952, pp. 87 ff.

<sup>5</sup>) represented in *Origen's Hexapla*, cf. *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures*, p. 87.



*Vocalisation and Accentuation.*

The most outstanding difference between the manuscripts is found in the field of *punctuation*. The beginning was probably made in manuscripts for *private use*.

We do not know for certain when the process of punctuation was begun. When *Jerome* (ca. 400), on Jer. 9,21, concerning the word *db̄r* says: *verbum hebraicum, quod tribus litteris scribitur Daleht, Beth, Res (vocales enim in medio non habet), pro consequentia et legentis arbitrio si legatur Dabar, sermonem significat, si Deber, mortem, si Daber, loquere* – it seems to indicate the non existence of vowel-points. In the *Talmud* the pronunciation of a word is sometimes discussed, e.g. *Baba bathra* 21a–b, where, however, manuscripts are not consulted, but rabbinic authorities. The tractate *Sopherim*, the basic elements of which presumably date from the 7th century A.D., and which in detail deals with all particulars concerning the writing, does not mention vowels. On the other hand, the sect of the *Qara'ites*, mentioned p. 54f., presuppose some sort of punctuation. And the leaders of the *Talmud* school of *Sura* in *Babylonia* (cf. p. 52) who in *Mohammedan* times were called “*Gaon*” (“excellency”) still know that the punctuation is relatively young. *Gaon Natronai II* in the 9th century A.D. has rejected the idea of punctuating the manuscripts of the *Torah* on the ground that punctuation did not originate on *Mount Sinai*, but was introduced by the *Wise*. But ca. 1100 a *Qaraite* *Juda Hadassi* has declared that God has not created the *Torah* without punctuation. In the time of the *Reformation* this theory penetrates to *Christian theology*, also in *Protestant circles*, who at the beginning had favoured the notion of *Elias Levita* that the punctuation was of *Mediaeval* origin: But *Mathias Flacius Illyricus*, in his disputation for the degree of *Master* in 1543, defended the idea that the vowel-points were as old as the consonants. This theory is further developed by *J. Buxtorf sen.* in his book *Tiberias* (1620, cf. p. 55). The rigoristic dogma of verbal inspiration developed by *Protestant orthodoxy* demanded as its ultimate consequence the dogma of the inspiration of the vowel-points. The unsoundness of this theory was proved by the Calvinist *Capellus* (cf. p. 10). In his steps followed the *Oratorian Rich. Simon* (p. 10), the Calvinist *Clericus*, and among others the learned editor of the *London-Polyglot* *Brian Walton* (cf. p. 59). A violent contest concerning this subject was the result. German and Swiss scholars (*J. Buxtorf jun.*, *De punctatorum ... origine, antiquitate et auctoritate* (1648); *Anticritica seu vindiciae veritatis hebraicae* (1653); and, as the last man on the walls: *Carpzow*, *Critica sacra* (1728)) stuck to the old positions and maintained the inspiration of the vowel-points, which is also taught in the *Formula consensus Helvetica* (1675).

Every form of textual criticism would be superfluous on this assumption; but the text has proved stronger than the theologians.

From the indications given above we may infer that the *punctuation must have begun at the end of the first millennium A.D., presumably about 700*. Before that time—e.g. in the Dead Sea Scrolls—we find a rather extensive, use of *matres lectionis* as a means of securing a correct pronunciation. About 700 A.D. the leading centres of Jewish learning were in *Babylonia*, and here it is generally assumed that the example of the *Nestorian* church has influenced the Jewish rabbis.

Recently *Kahle* has made an attempt to prove the thesis that the work of similar tendencies in the circles of *Mohammedan scholars* concerning the correct reading of the *Koran* has set an important example. At that time the Jews in Palestine and Babylonia were living under Arab rule. And at the same time, in connection with the *Qaraite* movement, ca. 760 A.D., the problem of the correct reading of the Holy Books became of primary interest to the Jews. Like the Mohammedans they had an *idea of a classical language*. But unlike the Arabs they had no concrete dialect, like that of the Arab Bedouin, to exalt as the pattern and representative of this classical speech. Accordingly they had to *create an ideal pronunciation* for the reading of the Word of God. At the same time, when Arab scholars introduced their vocalisation of the *Koran*, the Jews introduced their systems. They established new vowels for the restored pronunciation of the gutturals, and final vowels which had been lost in Hebrew, the double pronunciation of the BGDKFT, in the two first instances under Arab, in the last under Syriac influence.<sup>1)</sup>

How the oldest vocalisation and accentuation looked was for a long time unknown. A trace seemed to be found in a book written about 1100 A.D., the *Mahzor Vitry*,<sup>2)</sup> where the author says: “and corresponding to this the Tiberian punctuation is not similar to that common among us, and the two are not similar to the punctuation of the Land of Israel”. The speaker is a *Babylonian Jew*. This follows from his contrasting the punctuation “among us” with the “Tiberian” and “that of the Land of Israel”, i.e. a Palestinian system different from the Tiberian. It is further evident that he speaks of *three systems* of punctuation. Of these only the Tiberian was known, it is the system commonly used in our Bibles. In the 19th century a system with vowel-points above the lines, the *supralinear system*, became known. It is found in the *Petersburg Codex of Prophets* (cf. p. 61), and in some manuscripts from *Yemen*, for the most part preserved in Oxford, London, and Berlin. On account of the provenience they were

<sup>1)</sup> *Kahle*, Schweich Lectures, pp. 78–110;—cf. now below, p. 65, n. 2.

<sup>2)</sup> ed. by *Hurwitz*, p. 462, quoted by *Kahle* in the *Grammar of Bauer and Leander*, p. 83.

labelled "Yemenite", a name which then also was attached to the system of punctuation, but not rightfully. For it was this "Yemenite" system which *Kahle* proved to be *Babylonian*. Then it was only left to determine the meaning of the words "that of the Land of Israel". *Kahle* now in a series of manuscripts found another system, simpler, and therefore presumably older than the usual Tiberian vocalisation. After these decisive discoveries of *Kahle* we have to count four systems of vocalisation, for also in *Babylonia* a less complicated system was found. The more complicated Babylonian system is thought to have been introduced under influence of the *Qaraites*. So we have two Palestinian and two Babylonian systems. In Palestine the introduction of the complicated system also seems due to the influence of the *Qaraites*, and here the transition was more marked than in *Babylonia*, because the complicated Palestinian system, our Tiberian, puts its signs – most of them, at any rate – below the lines, while the older, simple system, "the punctuation of the Land of Israel", like the Babylonian systems, was supralinear. A *Qaraite* tradition reports that it was the *Qaraite Moses ben Mohe* who introduced the sublinear Tiberian system, ca. 800 A.D. As the last stage in the development we find that the Babylonian system is influenced and then finally superseded by the Tiberian system<sup>1</sup>).

As noted above the Tiberian massoretes were not quite unanimous. We have spoken of two schools (cf. p. 54f), the *Ben Asher* and the *Ben Naphtali* tradition, the differences of which are often alluded to by later Jewish writers. According to *Kahle's* view the learned *Maimonides* at the end of the 12th century has decided in favour of the text of *Een Asher*. But the *Ben Naphtali* tradition does not disappear. Most manuscripts are of mixed character. It is not until the 14th century that uniformity is so far attained that we can speak of a *textus receptus*. But as our glance at the printed editions has shown, even these contain variants.

From all this it follows that the *pronunciation of Hebrew* in modern times is an artificial pronunciation<sup>2</sup>). The aim of the punctuation has been to secure that every inspired sign for the consonants was distinctly read, and therefore each consonant has got some vowel-point or other of its own. But it is improbable that the spoken Hebrew language has been so niminy-piminy. *Kahle* has e.g. demonstrated that the relative particle <sup>1</sup>*ʾašer* has often been pronounced as if a *še*. was

<sup>1</sup>) *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 46f.; note especially his words on the *Petersburg Codex of Prophets* which misled *Cornill* in his book on *Ezekiel* (1886). The mistake was due to the circumstance that this *Babylonian* codex has been strongly influenced by Palestinian tradition.

<sup>2</sup>) The consequence for the treatment of the *Hebrew grammar* is stressed by *Kahle* also in his last work on the subject, the *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 109.



to be read.<sup>1)</sup> We also know that the pronominal suffix of the 2nd person sing. masc. has not always been pronounced as in our Tiberian texts, but with the vowel *a* before, not after the consonant *k*. This was already presumed by *Sievers* in his *Metrische Studien*, but it has been proved by *Kahle* to be an established fact<sup>2)</sup>. And also other phenomena serve to prove that our present pronunciation of Hebrew – also as spoken by modern Jews – is quite artificial.

*Literature:* The works by *Paul Kahle*, mentioned p. 55. Many of them contain beautiful facsimiles of ancient manuscripts. Selections of such pictures are also to be found in the great work *Facsimiles of Ancient Manuscripts*, ed. for the *Palaeographical Society* by *W. Wright*, Oriental Series III–IV, and in *A. Neubauer*, *Facsimiles of Ancient Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (1886). *Stade*, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel I* (1887), p. 32 gives good pictures of three well-known codices (*Reuchlin's Codex of the Prophets*, a manuscript from *Erfurt*, and the *Petersburg codex of Prophets* from 916). The latter is also published in facsimile by *Strack* (1876). *C. D. Ginsburg*, *A Series of 15 Facsimiles from Manuscript Pages of the Hebrew Bible* (1897).

## OTHER WITNESSES OF THE TEXT

By means of the great Hebrew manuscripts we are able to trace the history of the OT text up to the end of the first millennium A.D. The fragmentary texts, from the Cairo Geniza and the Dead Sea Scrolls carry us farther back. But nevertheless we must face the indisputable fact that the Jewish tradition of the Semitic Biblical text is comparatively young. This does not, however, mean that the Massoretic text is an unreliable text. On the contrary, in spite of the dismissal of the archetype theory and the discovery that behind our seemingly pretty uniform text there lies a greater multiplicity of variant material it is possible to maintain that *the Jewish fidelity and scrupulousness in handing down the sacred pages is a strong guarantee for the essential soundness of the text, outweighing the want of age.*

The *Dead Sea Scrolls*, even if they should not be pre-Christian, are witnesses both of the material soundness of the Hebrew text and of greater variety of readings in texts earlier than the time of the massorettes. *In the beginning was multiplicity*, probably pointing back ultimately to different circles of oral and written tradition.

<sup>1)</sup> *Der masoretische Text des Alten Testaments nach der Überlieferung der babylonischen Juden* (1902), p. 36.

<sup>2)</sup> *Metrische Studien I* (1901), pp. 288ff. cf. *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 98ff. — The discussion on *Kahle's* views in connection with the problem of the age of the *Dead Sea Scrolls* has concentrated very much on this point. There can be no doubt that in his main contention *Kahle* is right. The forms in *-ka* are very rare in the transcription-texts before the last phase of the massoretic work in the 8th century A.D. But they were no absolute innovation of the massorettes, and the Arabic example (p. 63) so may be of less importance (see *Baumgartner*, *Theol. Rundschau* 1951, pp. 133 and 145). *Kahle's* own reply to the inferences drawn concerning his theories is to be found in his contribution

*Traditions of the Text in Hebrew and other Semitic Languages.*

The Samaritan Pentateuch.

First among these witnesses we mention the document coming from the Palestinian Israelite congregation next to the Jews, the *Samaritans*. The Canon of the Samaritans (cf. p. 34f.) only contains the Pentateuch. Assuming that the Massoretic consonantal text in broad outline has been fixed ca. 100 A.D. it has been held as a general opinion that the Samaritan text is 300 or 400 years older. But against this view Wutz<sup>1)</sup> tells us that the Samaritan text, on account of the relations between its readings and those of the LXX, must be younger than LXX, and perhaps even younger than the Syriac version (the Peshitta). If this should be right, it must nevertheless be asserted that the Samaritan tradition is independent of the Jewish, even if it cannot with certainty be regarded as better. And it is not even quite probable that Wutz is right. The relations seem to be much more complicated. The influence which readings akin to the Samaritan text appear to have had on Greek texts from NT times<sup>2)</sup> seem to make the late date for the Samaritan text assumed by Wutz rather precarious.

The *Samaritanus* deviates in ca. 6000 cases from the Massoretic text, mostly in questions of mere orthography, peculiarities of grammar and of pronunciation. It has been assumed that the Samaritan text has been influenced by the *spoken language*, and that the more profuse use of *vowel-letters*, *omission of archaisic phrases* like the ending *ô* in Gen. 1,24 etc., represent a younger stage in the development. *Differences of matter* are e.g. the removal of the plural in verbs after *'alôhîm*, the more frequent appearances of an *angel* instead of God, the reading of *Gerizim* instead of *Ebal* in Deut. 27,4. The first two examples may be explained by the well-known fact that later times have an inclination to a stricter monotheism and to transcendentalize the idea of God. Concerning Deut. 27,4 the question if it is the Jews or the Samaritans who possess the right text is not easily answered. The same thing must be said concerning the genealogies of Gen. 5 and 11,10ff., where the numbers differ very much.

to the Nötscher-Festschrift (1950) and in *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (1951), pp. 26ff., espec. pp. 42ff. He has made some necessary modifications of his earlier views—cf. *Baumgartner*, Th. R., p. 133. The Arabic influence seems to be more doubtful than first assumed.—See also *Hammershaimb*, *Dansk Teol. Tidsskrift* 1949, pp. 159—161.

<sup>1)</sup> Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronimus (1925—33), p. 340f.

<sup>2)</sup> See the material in *Kahle's Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 144—148. P. 149 he sums up his results thus. "For the Pentateuch a second Hebrew text is preserved, the text used up to the present day by the Samaritans. Since many centuries the Samaritan Pentateuch is also a *textus receptus* without various readings. We have seen that a text similar to it must have been used also in Jewish circles, in the time before all earlier texts were replaced by the authoritative Hebrew text. The traces of different texts of the Greek Torah show that the Hebrew Torah was in earlier times not confined to the two forms of text preserved to us".—The *Dead Sea Scrolls* represent a similar "pre-massoretic" text.



What makes the use of the Samaritan text problematic is that it does not exist in a really good critical edition<sup>1</sup>). Even after the edition of *von Gall* (1914–18) this desideratum cannot be said to be satisfied. *Von Gall* has not at all exhausted the *manuscript material* which is found dispersed in the libraries and collections of London, Paris, Berlin, Leningrad, and in American libraries. The congregation of the Samaritans in *Nablus* (Shechem) is in possession of a very old copy, perhaps the oldest existing manuscript of the Pentateuch.

These manuscripts are not written in square script, but in a degenerate form of the old Semitic writing. Manuscripts from the 12th century A.D. and later have a punctuation very much like the older Palestinian system (cf. p. 73f.). It has probably been used by the Samaritans also in earlier times<sup>2</sup>). Further, the Samaritan manuscripts exhibit a peculiar form of division of the text, different from that of the Jews.

*Other witnesses* to the Samaritan text are *translations* founded on this form of the OT. We possess fragments of a *Greek* translation, a Samaritan counterpart of the LXX. There also exists a Samaritan *Targum* of the Pentateuch (Aramaic translation) the text of which has, however, never been fixed by the Samaritans<sup>3</sup>). And finally we can mention an *Arabic* translation, of which a real *textus receptus* exists<sup>4</sup>), a revision by a certain *Abū Saʿīd* (second half of the 13th century A.D.) of the Arabic version of *Saʿadya Gaon*, which was formerly used by the Samaritans<sup>5</sup>).

*Literature:* Older editions of the Samaritan text are found in the *Paris-* and *London-Polyglots*, both of the Hebrew text and the Targum. *A. Freiherr von Gall*, *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (1914–1918). The *Greek* text: *Glaue und Rahlf*s: *Fragmente des Samareitikon* (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, Göttingen, 1911). The *Aramaic* text: *Petermann und Vollers*, *Pentateuchus Samaritanus* (1872–1911), cf. *Kohn*, *ZDMG* 1893, p. 626–97; but *Petermann's* edition is quite unreliable, cf. *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 37f. The *Arabic* text: *Specimen e Literis Orientalibus, exhibens Librum Geneseos secundum Arabicam Pentateuchi Samaritani Versionem ab Abu Saʿīdo conscriptam.... e tribus codicibus edidit Abrahamus Kuenen* (Leyden 1851). *Libri Exodi et Levitici....* 1854. *Kahle*, *Die arabischen Bibelübersetzungen* (1904), pp. X–XIII.

*Kahle:* *Aus der Geschichte der ältesten hebräischen Bibelhandschrift* (in the *Festschrift to Baudissin*, 1918, pp. 247–60); *Textkritische und lexikalische Bemerkungen zum samari-*

<sup>1</sup>) concerning manuscripts of the Samaritanus, cf. *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 50, note 1. A picture of Samaritan script in *Kahle*, *Die hebr.-Handschr. aus der Höhle*, pl. 8.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Kahle*, *op. cit.* p. 49. <sup>3</sup>) cf. *Kahle*, *op. cit.* p. 36f.

<sup>4</sup>) *Kahle*, p. 38f.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. *Kahle*, *op. cit.* p. 38f.



tanischen Pentateuch (1898). Fragmente des samaritanischen Pentateuchtargums (ZA, 1901 pp. 78–101; 1902, pp. 1–22); Schweich Lectures 1941, p. 36ff. *Katten*, Untersuchungen zu Saadja's Pentateuchübersetzung (Thesis, Giessen, 1924). More literature in Kahle's Schweich Lectures, loc. cit. – *Winton Thomas*, in the OT and Modern Study, p. 256.

### The Targumim.

The Targums (Aramaic translations of the OT) owe their existence to the development which made Aramaic replace Hebrew as the spoken language of the Jews. Already before New Testament times it was necessary to translate the Hebrew text read in the synagogues. It might be made after the reading of the entire text of the day, or after each verse. Originally the interpreter, *me'turgēman*, was not allowed to use a written translation, a *targūm*, but had to translate from the leaf. Comparatively early, however, such translations have been written. The *Talmud*, Shabbath 115a, mentions a *Targum to Job* which is said to have existed in the time of *Gamaliel I*, the teacher of Paul. It has been assumed that the peculiar note in the "LXX" to Job 42,17b: "This has been translated from the Syriac Bible" alludes to this Targum. That *Jesus* on the cross uttered the prayer of Ps. 22,2 (Mk. 15,34; Mt. 27,46) in Aramaic form seems to presuppose a Targum to the *Psalms* as existing in His days. That Targums of the Hagiographa are the earliest might yield a basis for the assumption that the parts of the Bible not read in the service of the synagogue were the first to have their translations in written form, because there was no need for a prohibition of the writing down of these translations.

A manuscript found by *Kahle* among the Geniza-material seems to prove that Targums in written form must have been in use in the time *before the Mishna*. For the Targum of this manuscript disagrees with the official Mishna concerning the translation of Ex. 22,4–5. We therefore must suppose the *existence of written Targumim already in Christian and pre-Christian times*.<sup>1)</sup>

Most probably the Targumim were not the work of single persons, but rather of several men, perhaps commissions set up with the task of fixing the text which was then officially acknowledged<sup>2)</sup>

We possess Targumim to nearly all Biblical Hebrew books, except to Dan. and Ezra-Neh. For some books we even have several translations. They all have to be handled with caution when used for textual criticism, because they often are commentaries more than translations. As in the case of the Samaritanus we often have to deplore the lack of good modern editions.

<sup>1)</sup> *Kahle*, Schweich Lectures, 1941 pp. 122–24; cf. *Audet*, Journ. of Theol. Stud. (1950), p. 149. *Teicher*, Vetus Testamentum 1951, pp. 123, practically only repeats the arguments of *Weinberg*, answered by *Kahle* in his book, p. 123, n. 2.

<sup>2)</sup> *Kahle*, op. cit. p. 118.

The most important translation of the Pentateuch is the so-called *Targum Onkelos*, which is the *official Targum to the Law*. Tradition says that it comes from a proselyte, Onkelos, who is reported to have delivered it in the first half of the 2nd century A.D. (*Talmud*, Megilla 3a). But the name *Onkelos* seems to be a mistake of the name, occurring in the Palestinian Talmud and other Palestinian texts, 'qils, or 'qils, *Aquila*<sup>1)</sup>, the author of the Greek translation mentioned below. Onkelos is a Babylonian alteration of the original name. In Babylonia the name was connected with the Targum to the Torah, while the Palestinian Talmud used it of the Greek translation.

The translation of *Onkelos* is generally faithful to the text. Only in the poetical parts (Gen. 49; Num. 24; Deut. 32,33 etc.) it becomes a paraphrase. *Deviations* from the Massoretic text generally do not witness to another reading, but mean that the translation is free or has developed a commentary. *Anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms* in the idea of God have – according to the feelings of later Judaism – been removed, and the human weaknesses of the *Patriarchs* give way to the idealizing tendency of later days, e.g. Gen. 20,13; 27,13; 48,22. Old names are replaced by modern, Sinear becomes Babel, Ishmaelites Arabians. The scarce *Halachic* elements *Geiger*<sup>2)</sup> will explain as remnants of more abundant material of this kind, which has been removed according to the rigorous treatment of Scripture, inaugurated by *Akiba*. But *Steuernagel*<sup>3)</sup> thinks that these elements are better understood as beginnings of a *Halachic* augmentation of the material. Further, it is difficult to explain why – on the assumption that *Geiger* were right – this material has not been completely expurgated.

*Onkelos* certainly rests on a long tradition of translation, dating back to pre-Christian times. The *language* of the translation seems to indicate that the recording in writing has taken place in the 2nd century A.D., the language being still closely related to Biblical Aramaic, but comparatively far from the Aramaic of the Talmud<sup>4)</sup>. The *Jerusalem Talmud*, Megilla 74d, knows a Targum to the Pentateuch recorded in writing at the time mentioned. From Palestine this Targum is assumed to have come to Babylonia, a circumstance probably accounting for a vague Babylonian colour of the language. The final redaction is thought to have taken place in the 4th–5th century A.D. In the course of time

<sup>1)</sup> Kahle, op. cit. p. 117f.

<sup>2)</sup> Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel (1857), ed. by Kahle (1928), p. 163f.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 63.

<sup>4)</sup> Kahle, Schweich Lectures 1941, p. 119, characterizes the Aramaic of *Onkelos* as "somewhat better than the Greek of *Aquila*. It is pedantic too, but perhaps not so awkward".



this Targum has attained authoritative importance. From the 9th century we have evidence of its official status. It even gets a *Massora* of its own, of Eastern type.

The text is found in *Rabbinical Bibles* and *Polyglots*. Separate edition by *Berliner* (1884–86). On the *language* and the *Massora*, cf. *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 118ff.; concerning the edition of *Berliner*, *Kahle*, *op. cit.* p. 129.

Besides the Targum Onkelos there also exist other Targumim to the Pentateuch. One of them, was – in contrast to the Targum Onkelos, especially admired in Babylonia – called the *Targum Yerushalmi*. Most frequently, however, it is called by a somewhat inappropriate name: *Targum Jonathan*. The name is a misunderstanding of an abbreviation of the name Targum Yerushalmi, and this misunderstanding is particularly unlucky because *Targum Jonathan* also denotes a Targum to the Prophets (cf. below). The name *Jonathan* is probably a translation of the Greek name *Theodotion*<sup>1)</sup>. On account of this ambiguity of the name Targum Jonathan it is better to use the title *Targum Yerushalmi I*, the number I indicating that there are two other Targumim to the Pentateuch, the so-called “*Fragmentary Targumim*”, known as *Targum Yerushalmi II and III*. Several fragments have been found by *Kahle* among the material from the Cairo Geniza.<sup>2)</sup>

These Targumim are written in *Palestinian dialect*, and the translations have been completely drowned in *Halachic* and *Haggadic* material, which (cf. above) supports the assumption that these Targumim are of later date. To Gen. 21,21 *Targ. Yer. I* mentions some female relatives of Muhammad which would mean that the Targum cannot be older than the 7th century A.D. But the names may be later insertions, and *Targ. Yer. II* generally is supposed to be a little older. But of course these Targumim like the Targum Onkelos contain earlier *material*.

A question concerning the Fragmentary Targum, *Yer. II*, has till now not been answered satisfactorily. We do not know if it was originally a complete Targum, or if it is only a collection of marginal notes and variants to a complete Targum (Onkelos? or an original form of *Yer. I*?). And the relations between the different Targums are upon the whole not clear. At least, the Palestinian Targum was not, like the Babylonian Onkelos, an official version<sup>3)</sup>.

The *texts* are found in the *London-Polyglot*. The oldest *prints* are: The *Rabbinical Bible* from Venice 1518 (*Yer. II*). *Asher Forins*, Venice 1591 (all the Targumim to the Pentateuch). — *M. Ginsburger*, *Das Fragmententargum zum Pentateuch* (1899), *Pseudo-Jonathan* (1903). *Schürer*, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, 3<sup>r</sup>. ed. I, p. 155f. *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 121ff.

<sup>1)</sup> *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 118, with reference to *S. D. Luzzatto*.

<sup>2)</sup> *Masoreten des Westens II*, pp. 1–65, cf. *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 120ff.

<sup>3)</sup> *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 125.



To the prophets only one complete Targum is known. *Megilla 3a* reports that its author is a certain *Jonathan ben Uzziel*, according to *Baba bathra 134a* a pupil of *Hillel*. It is therefore called *Targum Jonathan*, not be to confused with the Targum "Pseudo-Jonathan" just mentioned as a Targum to the Pentateuch. Originally a translation of the name *Theodotion* (the reviser of the Greek Bible text) the word *Jonathan* was later combined with that of a pupil of *Hillel*. While the Targum to the *Torah* was combined with the Greek translator *Aquila* that of the *Prophets* was joined to the Greek *Theodotion*.<sup>1)</sup>

The *Targum Jonathan* has a strong character of *paraphrase*, not so pronounced in the prophetae priores as in the posteriores, which makes a *late date* probable (cf. p. 69). It may be added that its quotations of the Law betray *dependence of the Targum Onkelos*. This is to be reconciled with the tradition that its author was a pupil of *Hillel* by stressing that *Megilla 3a* only alludes to oral delivery, not to *Jonathan* as the writer. But the tradition of the identity of the author is upon the whole uncertain, the Babylonian *Talmud* frequently quoting it as coming from the 4th century, from a *rabbi Joseph*. But this is not valid, for *rabbi Joseph* too is only introduced as authority for oral tradition. Even if old material, then, may be presupposed in *Targum Jonathan*, the dependance upon *Targum Onkelos* must prove that *Targum Jonathan* cannot have been edited till the 5th century A.D.<sup>2)</sup>

Fragments of another Targum to the *Prophets* are e.g. preserved in the *Codex of Reuchlin* (cf. p. 55). It is often quoted under the misleading name of *Yerushalmi*.

*Texts:* *Targum Jonathan* is found in the *Rabbinic Bibles* and in the *Polyglots*. – *Lagarde*, *Prophetae Chaldaice* (1872), gives an edition of the text in *Cod. Reuchl.* without vowels. *Separate editions of Joshua and Judges*, by *Prätorius* (1899 and 1900), and of *Jer. 1–12*, by *Wolfsohn* (1902).

To the *Hagiographa* we have many and very different Targums. As early as 1764 *Dathe* proved that the *Targum to Proverbs* was no translation of the Hebrew text, but from the *Syriac* translation. The Targum to the *Psalms* is sometimes verbatim, sometimes a paraphrase, and it contains, like the Targum to *Job*, combinations of several translations, sometimes introduced as quotations from another Targum. – The Targumim to *Megilloth Steuernagel*<sup>3)</sup> describes as "Midrashesh", i.e. paraphrastic commentaries. To *Esther*, however, we have one which is comparatively literal, while a couple are very elaborate. To *Chron.*

<sup>1)</sup> Kahle, op. cit. p. 118.

<sup>2)</sup> On the language, cf. Kahle, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 120.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 66.

there is a relatively literal translation, but with several *Haggadic* extensions. Most of these Targums are at most of the same *age* as the Targ. Yer. to the Pentateuch.

*Texts:* Everything except the Targum to Chron. in the *Rabbinic Bible* from 1518. Chron. ed by Beck (1680–83). Lagarde, Hagiographa Chaldaice (1873).

*Literature to the Targumim:* Dalman, Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch (2nd ed. 1905). Dalman made a mistake in considering the language of *Targum Onkelos* characteristic of the language spoken in Palestine at the time of Christ. This was already seen by Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* 2nd ed. 1911, pp. 38–43, cf. Kahle, Schweich Lectures 1941, pp. 129ff. Dalman, *Aramäische Dialektproben* (1896). Kurzgefasstes aramäisch-neuhebräisches Wörterbuch (2nd ed. 1922). All these works have to be used in light thrown upon them by Kahle, Schweich Lectures 1941, pp. 117ff., cf. also Masoreten des Ostens (1913), p. 203f.; Masoreten des Westens II (1930), pp. 1\*ff. – Jansma, *Twee Haggadas uit de Palestijnse Targum van de Pentateuch* (1950). Winton Thomas, in *The OT and Modern Study*, p. 257.

#### Arabic translations.

An *Arabic* translation was mentioned in connection with the *Samaritan* text. Of the OT we have several Arabic translations, also represented in the *Paris* and *London Polyglots*. They are of very different origin, and some come from other texts than the Hebrew Jewish.

The most famous Arabic translation was that of an Egyptian Jew, *Saadya*, from the Fayyum. He became, ca. 928 A.D., president of the school at *Sura* in Babylonia (cf. p. 62), but had to leave the town soon after. In 935 he returned, and died in 942. Fragments of his translation, coloured by his interpretation and his philosophy, have been preserved.

Survey of the evidence of the text by Kahle, *Die arabischen Bibelübersetzungen* (1904), pp. VIII–XIII, with specimens of the texts, nos. V–VII. J. Dérenbourg, *Version Arabe du Pentateuch. Oeuvres complètes de Rabbi Saadia Ben Josef al-Fayyumi* (Paris 1893). A Jerusalem edition, together with the Hebrew text and the Targum Onkelos (1894–1901), is mentioned by Kahle, Schweich Lectures 1941, p. 39, n. 2. Here the insufficiency of Dérenbourg's and the Jerusalemite editions is stressed.

#### The Syriac translation.

The Ancient *Syrian Church* has developed its own translations of the Bible, both of the Old and the New Testament. The translation is called *Peshitta* or *Peshitto*. It is not quite certain what this word means. The Syriac form *p<sup>e</sup>šittā* is the status emphaticus<sup>1)</sup>. According to Brockelmann<sup>2)</sup> it means "simplex". But it is disputed what this involves. Very widespread is the opinion that it means

<sup>1)</sup> Conc. the pronunciation, cf. Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik* § 26b.

<sup>2)</sup> *Lexicon Syriacum*, 2nd ed.

the “*common*”, a term corresponding to the Latin “*Vulgate*”, used of the Latin translation of the Roman Church. This interpretation has some support in the meaning of the root of the word. But others think that it means the “*simple*” in contrast to the Syrian edition of the Hexapla of *Origen* (p. 79) and other *learned* translations.

The origin of this translation is obscure<sup>1</sup>). *Peshitta* is known as the normal text of the Church from the end of the 4th century A.D. But it is certainly older. There are two forms of the text of the *Law*<sup>2</sup>), one rather verbatim, the other freer and more conformed to the spirit of the Syrian language. The former being found in the oldest preserved manuscript, from the year 464, it is thought to be the oldest. In several respects the translation of the Law seems related to the *Palestinian Targum* (cf. p. 70). The translation is assumed to have been created in the first century A.D. by Jews from the Eastern Syriac regions for the use of the kingdom of *Adiabene*, where Judaism, according to *Josephus*, had been introduced by the royal house<sup>3</sup>).

The Syrian Canon wavers concerning the canonicity of some OT books, e.g. *Chron.* and *Wisd.* (cf. pp. 31 and 41). We have also mentioned that the oldest manuscript dates from the year 464 A.D. But it has been proved that already *Aphraates* and *Ephraem Syrus* have used the translation, and the Syrian Church dating from the 2nd century A.D. has certainly at an early time developed its own translation. Traditions carry it back to the events recorded in 2 Ki. 17,27f. or even to the time of Solomon!

The translation is generally good, sometimes a little influenced by *Jewish* tradition. This is no wonder, remembering the theory concerning its origin, alluded to above. In *Chron.*, translated at a later time, probably from a *Jewish Targum*, all anthropomorphisms are scrupulously omitted. Sometimes too influence from *Greek* renderings may be traced. This will be of importance for the use of *Peshitta* in textual criticism (cf. p. 97). Above (p. 71) we have mentioned that the Syriac translation of *Proverbs* has been used as a basis for a *Jewish Targum*.

We have no reliable critical edition. The *British and Foreign Bible Society* in 1823 published an edition by *Lee*, founded on the text of the *London Polyglot*, which again depends upon the *Paris Polyglot*, but also on some manuscripts, among them a copy of one belonging to the *Maronitic patriarch*. The same form of the text, probably a *Western Syriac*, is found in the *Codex Ambrosianus*, ed. 1878–83 by *Ceriani*. *Eastern Syriac* (Nestorian) texts are behind an edition from *Urmia* 1852, arranged by American missionaries.

1) *Theodor of Mopsuestia*, quoted by *Swete*, *Introd. to the OT in Greek*, p. 112.

2) cf. *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 179ff.

3) *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 185ff. gives a detailed account of this story.



*Lagarde*, *Libri Veteris Testamenti Syriace* (1861).

Some parts have been critically treated, cf. *W. E. Barnes*, *An apparatus criticus to Chron. in the Peshitta version* (1897); *The Peshitta Psalter according to the West Syrian Text with an apparatus criticus* (1904). *Dietrich*, *Ein Apparatus criticus zur Pešitto zum Propheten Jesaja* (1905).

*Bloch*, The printed text of the Peshitta OT (*Am. Journ. of Sem. Lang.* 1920–21, pp. 136–44). *Hänel*, Die aussermasoretischen Übereinstimmungen zwischen der Septuaginta und der Peschitta des AT mit Rücksicht auf ihre textkritische Bearbeitung und Herausgabe (1927).

Among both the *Western Syrians* and the *Nestorians* there exists a *Massora* to Peshitta: *Dietrich*, Die Massorah der östlichen und westlichen Syrer in ihren Angaben zum Propheten Jesaja (1890), cf. concerning *Ruth* ZATW 1902, pp. 193ff.

*Winton Thomas*, The O T and Modern Study, pp. 257ff.; *Vööbus*, Neuentdecktes Textmaterial zur Vetus Syra, in *Theol. Zeitschr. Basel* (1951), pp. 30ff., calls attention to material concerning an earlier translation, not sufficiently explored.

### *The Greek translations.*

When *Alexander the Great* conquered the Persian Empire Greek culture and the Greek language spread over the Orient and the countries where the Jewish people after the Babylonian exile had been dispersed. As these countries partly and for a time used Greek, both as spoken language (at least in the cities) and as the language of their literature, the Jews consequently were in need of a translation, so to say a *Targum* in this language.

In this respect the *Egyptian* diaspora has been of great importance. In *Persian* times this part of the “dispersion” — at least as we know it — was represented by the military colony at *Elephantine* the language of which was the *Aramaic* of the Persian Empire, which was also the idiom of Asiatic Judaism, and in which its *Targums* later are written. But with the *conquest of Egypt by Alexander* this is changed. The great city of *Alexandria* got a very important Jewish colony. Its *Canon* has been described above. We now have to deal with the Greek translation, or rather the Greek translations created in this environment.

The Christian authors *Clemens Alexandrinus* (*Strom.* I, 22) and *Eusebius* (*Praep. Evang.* XIII, 12) quote the Jewish historian *Aristobulus* (ca. 170–150 B.C.<sup>1)</sup>) as a witness to Greek translations of parts of the OT from the time *before Alexander*. This information has generally not been trusted by historians. It is assumed to be an expression of the inclination of Alexandrian Judaism to assert the priority of their literature against the Greek philosophy<sup>2)</sup>. At all events we do not know anything concerning early translations of this kind. On the other hand it is possible that *Wutz*<sup>3)</sup> may be right in his hypothesis of *Greek transcriptions* of the Hebrew text having existed along with trans-

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Schürer*, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes ...* III, 4th ed., p. 512f.

<sup>2)</sup> *Steuernagel*, p. 45.

<sup>3)</sup> Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus (1933).

lations. This would then be illustrated e.g. by the second column of Origen's *Hexapla* (cf. below). From transcriptions of this kind the "LXX" is supposed to have preserved *proper names*, but also groups of words which have not been translated, but transcribed<sup>1)</sup>.

## The Septuagint.

### *The current view.*

*The Letter of Aristeas* gives us information concerning the Alexandrian translation of the Law, which after the 72 interpreters has got the name "*Septuaginta*" (LXX). This legend which only in some respects can claim to be "historical" is expanded by the *Church Fathers*, except *Jerome*<sup>2)</sup>, to concern the whole Old Testament in Greek. This is not the case among the Jews, e.g. *Philo*, who — although he has exaggerated the miraculous character of the translation by reporting that the interpreters worked in rigorous isolation from one another — only speaks of the translation of the Law (*De vita Mosis* II, 24–44). *Josephus* (*Ant.* XII, 11–119, cf. I, 10–12) generally also speaks only of the Law, but sometimes (*C. Ap.* II, 45) he talks of "our laws and the books of holy writings" in connection with the *Aristeas* legend.

How early the translation of the "LXX" can be traced is a matter of dispute. A Jewish writer, *Demetrius*, working under *Ptolemy IV* (222–205), has used "LXX" in a work "*On the Kings of Judaea*"<sup>3)</sup>. This has been taken as a confirmation of the *Letter of Aristeas*. For *Aristeas* places his story in the period of *Ptolemy II* (285–246). But we cannot be sure that the reference is to the "LXX", for as we shall see, another date of this translation is more probable.

*The Prologue to Ecclesiastes*, ca. 130 B.C., informs us that at that time not only the Law, but "the Prophets" and "the rest of the Books" had been translated into Greek. It can also be proved that about 157 B.C. the Jewish historian *Eupolemus* has used a Greek translation of *Chron.*<sup>4)</sup> A certain *Aristeas* in a work "*On the Jews*" is quoted in connection with a translation of the Book of *Job*<sup>5)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 712.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. the material collected in *Wendland's* edition. *Patrol. Lat.* XXIII, p. 985; XXV, 570; XXIV, p. 914b; XXV, p. 1227D. — The historicity of the *Letter of Aristeas* was first challenged by *Hody* in *Contra historiam Aristeae de LXX interpretibus dissertatio* (Oxford 1685), cf. also *Tarn*, *The Greeks in Bactria and India* (1938), pp. 414–36. *Tarn* dates the letter to ca. 100 B.C., cf. *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 135.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Schürer*, op. cit. III, 4th ed., pp. 472ff.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Schürer*, op. cit., pp. 474ff. *Freudenthal*, *Alexander Polyhistor* (1875), pp. 108 and 119.

<sup>5)</sup> *Schürer*, op. cit., p. 480.

at the end of the 2nd century B.C. The Greek translation of *Esther* is ambiguously dated, but it seems to have been known in Egypt as late as 48 B.C.<sup>1)</sup> The oldest quotation of the *Psalms*, 1 Macc. 7,11 (Ps. 79,2ff.), dates from ca. 100 B.C. But it is probable that this important book which in some places represents the whole collection of the Hagiographa (cf. p. 26) has been translated much earlier<sup>2)</sup>. We are entitled to presume that translations of the Biblical books were extant at the beginning of our era. That *Philo* does not quote Ez., Dan., and the 5 Megilloth, and that certain books (cf. p. 28) are not quoted in the NT, may be accidental. But the "LXX", as is well known, contained more than the Hebrew Canon.

The current view treats all this evidence as concerning what is called the "LXX". As we shall see, this view must be revised in the light of modern investigations. But provisionally we shall go on to give an account of the current view of "LXX". Later we may then present the views which just now are beginning to alter the situation.

From what has been said the current view concludes that the "LXX" is not a unity.

In the Pentateuch *Herrmann* and *Baumgärtel* have observed differences in the translation, and they also think that several hands are at work in Ez.<sup>3)</sup> Moreover, the translations of the different books are very unlike one another. The Pentateuch, e.g., is rather verbatim, but in other places it develops into a free paraphrase, e.g. in Isaiah and Daniel. The latter deviates so much from Hebraica veritas that the so-called "LXX" of Dan. was superseded by the revision of *Theodotion*<sup>4)</sup>. The "LXX" would accordingly not be an appropriate text for the instruction of theological students in OT matters, as proposed by *Harnack* and others. For the Greek translations, if they are to be studied scientifically, presuppose knowledge of the Hebrew text which they try to paraphrase or translate. The "LXX" is not a translation, but a theological commentary — this verdict was once passed on it in a lecture by *Rudolf Kittel*<sup>5)</sup>, and this is not too pointed. There also seems to have been more than one translation of several of the books<sup>6)</sup>: *H. St. John Thackeray* in his grammar of the OT in Greek<sup>7)</sup> has pointed out a series of differences in the Greek diction of

<sup>1)</sup> *Steuernagel*, p. 46.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Gerleman*, in the work mentioned p. 86.

<sup>3)</sup> *Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta* (1923).

<sup>4)</sup> cf. my commentary on Daniel.

<sup>5)</sup> At the German "Orientalistentag" in Leipzig 1921.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. *Steuernagel*, p. 47.

<sup>7)</sup> I (1909), pp. 12-16.



the books and of different parts of them<sup>1</sup>). Many of these observations, it may be remarked, will be more fully understood on the basis of the new theories referred to below.

In the times after the beginning of our era the translation must have suffered much from *textual corruption*. This is commonly thought to be due to the fact that it *lost authority in Jewish circles*. Originally, as the legends concerning the origin of the translation of the Law show, it was the object of great reverence. Philo regards it as inspired (De vita Mosis I, 37, where we have a very strong expression of belief in its literal inspiration). And a Palestinian Jew like Josephus is also influenced by the legend of Aristeas. In the NT it is generally considered by scholars to be the source of most quotations — but several passages defy identification with what is generally called “LXX”. Its authority in the Church was the source of Jewish opposition against it. Against the Church the Jews maintained that Is. 7,14 does not speak of a “virgin” (parthénos), but of a “young woman” (neânis). The Christians here rightly asserted that the translation parthénos came from the Jewish translators. But in other cases we must admit veritable *Christian interpolations*, e.g. in Ps. 96,10 (“LXX”: 95)<sup>2</sup>). The fixing of the *Palestinian Canon* among the Jews at the end of the 1st century A.D. (cf. pp. 27ff.) has also been cause of the fluctuating value of the “LXX” among the Jews. But most important was a tendency which at this time emerges among the Jews, to pay an enormously *strong attention to every single letter* of the Sacred Text. Akiba (ca. 130 A.D.) has stressed that the particle *’eth* before “the Heavens” in Gen. 1,1 can be understood as “with” (taking it not as the mark of the accusative, but as a preposition), and accordingly he concluded from the word that God “*with* the Heavens and the Earth” had created also the sun, the moon, the constellations, the trees, the plants, and the garden of Eden. This makes us understand that the translation of the “LXX”, often so free, could not assert its authority. It therefore among Greek speaking Jews was replaced by other translations<sup>3</sup>).

A great effort to save the text of the “LXX” was made by the learned scholar Origen. While Justin Martyr (ca. 150 A.D.) still accuses the Jews of having taken away the allusion to the cross of the Saviour in the just mentioned passage of Ps. 96, the *Alexandrian school* of Christian theology deleted this interpolation,

<sup>1</sup>) concerning the Ezra-texts, cf. II.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. the commentaries to the passage, and the Introduction to the compendious edition of Rahlfs, p. VII—(cf. John Keble’s translation of the old Latin hymn “*Vexilla regis produnt*”, where the verse is called a “true verse that through the wide world rings”; in the sense of textual criticism this is not “true”; but theologically the interpolation — which is no interpretation either — has expressed a truth of great importance).

<sup>3</sup>) cf. pp. 89ff. and Rahlfs, p. VIII.

so that it is not found in the oldest manuscripts, but only preserved in Coptic and Latin translations.<sup>1)</sup>

In order to be able to compare the texts *Origen* created the famous *Hexapla*. According to the investigations of *Rahlfs* the work was carried out "in the fourth decade of the third century A.D." in Palestine. *Origen* arranged the texts of the Bible in six parallel columns (hence the name "Hexapla"). 1) Hebrew text, 2) Hebrew text in Greek transcription<sup>1a)</sup>, 3) the most accurate translation: *Aquila*, 4) *Symmachus*, 5) "LXX", 6) the revision of the latter by *Theodotion*. But he also had columns of other Greek translations, the *Quinta*, *Sexta*, and the *Septima*, which will appear to be of new importance for our understanding of the whole complex problem of the Greek translations of the Bible. *Rahlfs*<sup>2)</sup> stresses that the arrangement of the columns proves that to *Origen* as a scholar the Hebrew, not the Greek text was normative. This is also evident from the ingenious *system of signs* by which he tried to describe the relations between the original text and the "LXX". Where the "LXX" had more than the Hebrew text *Origen* prefixed the sign of *obelos*, —, ÷, or —. This sign was used by Alexandrian philologists in their textual criticism, e.g. in Homer, to signify that the place was not "genuine". *Origen* has used it in the same way. He says in his commentary on Matthew<sup>3)</sup> that he put an *obelos* at a section which was not in the original text, because he "did not venture to take it completely away": This must mean a hint from *Origen* that if he were to act consistently he would have deleted the passage in question. The sections of the "LXX", to which *Origen* added a passage based on the Hebrew original supported by the younger translations, were marked by the sign of an asterisk, ✱. The end of sections with obelos or asterisk was indicated by a *metobelos*, √. But in addition he also altered the text of the "LXX" according to the Hebrew original and the younger translations, and this was, lamentably enough, not indicated by any signs. He has corrected the forms of proper names, but also the phraseology when it diverged too much from the Hebrew text. This was partly caused by the system of columns which demanded that the words in the lines must correspond to the right word in the Hebrew columns, each Hebrew line containing generally 1–2 words against 2–3 in the Greek columns.

*Origen's* intention was only to use his *Hexapla* for scientific and apologetic work, in order that the Christian theologians should not be embarrassed in discussions with the Jews, always reverting to the Massoretic text and mocking at the "LXX". But for the use of the Church he would preserve the old "LXX"—

<sup>1)</sup> *Rahlfs*, p. XI.

<sup>1a)</sup> cf. p. 61.

<sup>2)</sup> p. XII.

<sup>3)</sup> *Rahlfs*, op. cit.



text. He defended this by reference to the ancient sentence "Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set" (Prov. 22,28, cf. Deut. 19, 14 etc.).

Besides the Hexapla there also existed a *Tetrapla*, without the Hebrew columns.

Through the *fifth column* a *recension of the "LXX"* was created which had been *adapted to the Hebrew text*. A great part of this text has been preserved, not in the original, but in a scrupulously accurate translation into *Syriac*. It was written in 616–7 A.D. by *Paul of Tella*. The *Hagiographa* and the *Prophets* of this translation are found in the *Codex syrohexaplaris Ambrosianus*, edited in facsimile by *Ceriani* in 1874. Valuable fragments of the Hexapla are also found in the so-called *Fragments of Mercati*, a copy of the second to the sixth columns of ten fragments of the Psalms.<sup>1)</sup>

A great peril was incurred through the Hexapla of *Origen*: *His 5th column was in reality a new form of the text of the "LXX"*. It was often copied, but it never superseded the older forms which were preserved through their use in the Church. So the confusion in the texts did not disappear. From *Jerome* we know that different provinces of the Church arranged new editions of the text of the "LXX". *Eusebius of Caesarea* and his friend *Pamphilus* eagerly worked for the distribution of the Hexaplaric text. In the beginning these texts preserved the critical signs of *Origen*, but later they were omitted, because they were without practical significance when the "LXX"-column was edited separately, without connexion with the parallel columns. But this did not contribute to the reliability of the text.

Besides, a presbyter from Antiochia, *Lucian* (d. 311), created a new recension of the "LXX". It is possible that it was a revision of pre-Hexaplaric texts, but there are also other possibilities for the explanation of the *Lucianic recension*<sup>2)</sup>. Especially the occurrence of "Lucianic" readings in writers from the first century A.D. (Josephus) has puzzled scholars. We may here anticipate our relation of the new theories on the "LXX" by noting that we probably have to take into account that later copyists have "corrected" e.g. Josephus to make his text uniform with the official text of the Church<sup>3)</sup>. *Lucian* probably revised

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Klostermann*, ZATW 1896, p. 334–37; *E. Brönno*, Studien über hebräische Morphologie und Vokalismus auf Grundlage der Mercatischen Fragmente der zweiten Kolumne der Hexapla des Origenes (1943); *Kahle*, Schweich Lectures 1941, pp. 13ff. and 230–34.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Steuernagel* p. 53.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *A. Mez*, Die Bibel des Josephus (1895). *S. R. Driver*, Notes on the Hebrew text ... of the Books of Samuel (1913), p. LXXI and LXXVII. *Kahle*, Schweich Lectures 1941, pp. 150ff.; Die hebr. Handschriften aus der Höhle, pp., 33ff. (above, p. 37); *Kahle* assumes that Josephus himself has used a "Lucianic" text (p. 34, n. 21).



not the text called the "LXX", but a different version <sup>1)</sup>. In *Egypt* a recension by a bishop *Hesychius* was much used from ca. 300 A.D. <sup>2)</sup>.

All these "editions" have influenced one another, and this of course has increased the confusion in the text of the "LXX" <sup>3)</sup>. Consequently, the "LXX" must be handled with much caution in textual criticism. The determination of the text of the "LXX" is a problem in itself. For the solution of this problem we have a very rich material of *manuscripts*, at least concerning the quantity. Especially the discovery of *papyrus-documents* in recent years leads the evidence for the text of some parts of the Bible very far back in Antiquity, as far as the 2nd century A.D. Some of the important *Chester-Beatty-papyri* are as old as that century. They contain parts of Gen., Num., Deut., Is., Jer., Ez., Esth., Dan., Sir., and Hen (97-107). The Canonical texts from this collection have been published by *Kenyon* in 1933-37. They are of special importance for the text of the Book of *Daniel*, because we here have the "LXX" of some parts of this book which in most manuscripts has been replaced by *Theodotion's* revision. These papyri therefore in an eminent way supplement the *Codex Chisianus* which hitherto has been the best witness to the "LXX"-text of Dan. — A little younger than these papyri are some *fragments from the 3rd century A.D.* containing parts of Gen. and of the Dodecapropheton, edited in 1927 by *Sanders* and *Carl Schmiidt* (The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection and the Berlin Fragment of Genesis). But much earlier is *Papyrus Rylands Greek 458*, containing some pieces of Deut., dating from the 2nd century B. C., and a papyrus <sup>4)</sup> with the Tetragrammaton in square Hebrew letters, the *Papyrus Fouad 266* of Cairo.

From this evidence of early "LXX"-texts it has been assumed that there has existed an "*Urseptuaginta*", a "primitive Septuagint", the source and *archetype* of all other Greek forms of the Old Testament <sup>5)</sup>.

### *Kahle's theory.*

This idea of an "Urtext", an *archetype*, can be traced back especially to *Paul de Lagarde* <sup>6)</sup>. Of course he did not work upon the papyrus-discoveries, unknown to his time. But his idea was that behind the great "LXX"-material it would be at least the goal of the scientific work in this field to reconstruct the "Ur-

<sup>1)</sup> *Kahle*, op. cit., p. 176. <sup>2)</sup> cf. *W. Bauer* in RGG, 2nd ed., s. v. *Hesychius*.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Baumgärtel*, in RGG, 2nd ed. I, col. 1040; *Kahle*, Die hebr. Handschr. aus der Höhle, p. 9.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Kahle*, Die hebr. Handschr. aus der Höhle, pp. 7ff. and pl. 11, cf. The OT and Modern Study, p. 249, n. 2, with further references.

<sup>5)</sup> *Septuaginta-Studien*, in Abhandlungen der Hist.-Philos. Klasse der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1891, p. 71f., cf. *Kahle*, Schweich Lectures 1941, p. 156f. and 175.

text" of the "LXX". But it is very doubtful if we are able to reconstruct such an "urtext", and also, if we are entitled to assume its existence.

In this question, as in so many other fields of the textual history of the OT, fresh and startling, but on closer inspection methodically well-founded theories have been established by *Paul Kahle*. His Schweich Lectures from 1941<sup>1)</sup> have given a treatment of the problem of the LXX which cannot be overlooked by any one working in this field. And in my opinion the treatment of the matter gives the answer to the questions which the current view, related above, leaves open.

*Kahle* starts by investigating anew the *Letter of Aristeas*. Of course he rejects its historicity. He describes it as a *work of propaganda* dealing with a *version of the Torah* approved by the Jewish community of Alexandria, a version regarded as a *standard text*. This text must be *contemporary with the letter*, for nobody makes propaganda for something which is a hundred years old or older. According to the researches of *Bickermann* and *Tarn*<sup>2)</sup> the letter must be dated about 100 B.C., or perhaps a little earlier (130).

But the letter also attests the existence of *earlier translations* of the Law (§ 30). These are characterized as "careless". The §§ 31ff. of the letter refer to the use of the Law by the historian *Theopompus* and the poet *Philodectus*, who were punished by God because they quoted earlier and unreliable translations. These Greek authors lived in the 4th century, which is too early for Greek translations of the Jewish Law. But, as *Kahle* points out, the letter of Aristeas had to quote such early authorities because it pretends to be written in the early parts of the 3rd century. On the other hand, *Kahle* rightly concludes that the reference to these earlier translations proves that the translation, recommended by the letter, the LXX, must be a *revision*. Like other scholars<sup>3)</sup>, *Kahle* thinks that the idea of a *commission* of revisers lies behind the idea of the rabbis fetched from Palestine, who play the great part in the letter. He also takes the report of their connection with the island of *Pharos* to be true: This is corroborated by the festival held there annually to celebrate the memory of the translation, which is mentioned by *Philo* (*De vita Mosis* II, 41-43). Only the members of the commission did not come from Palestine, and not on the command of the king: This and other features of course belong to the legendary embellishments.

*Kahle* starts his own solution of the problem of the "LXX" by referring to

<sup>1)</sup> pp. 132-179.

<sup>2)</sup> *Bickermann*, in ZNTW 1930, pp. 280-96; *Tarn*, *The Greeks in India and Bactria* (1938), p. 425.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. above, p. 76.



his investigations of the *Targumim*. These works, as we have seen, can be traced back into pre-Christian times<sup>1)</sup>. And *Kahle* thinks that the example set in these works by the Palestinian Jews was followed by their Egyptian brethren who needed a Greek translation just as the Palestinians had to create an Aramaic version. According to the letter there had been several unsuccessful attempts, but at last they got the translation, the revised edition of the translation of the Law, mentioned by *Aristeas*.

But like other new translations of the Bible (e.g. the Vulgate) it was not accepted at once and universally. Therefore we may assume that *other Greek translations* continued to exist alongside it during the following centuries. The revised edition of the Greek Torah which had been so highly praised by the Jews, e.g. by *Philo* (*De vita Mosis* II, 37,40), was however after 70 A.D. rejected by the Jews, because they now revised their Hebrew text of the Torah and therefore needed new Greek translations (*Aquila*, *Symmachus*), or at least revisions (*Theodotion*). They went so far that they declared the LXX-Torah to be the work of Satan! It was no longer transmitted by the Jews. Only the papyrus fragments mentioned above<sup>2)</sup>, dating from the 2nd or 1st centuries B.C., come from *Jewish* copyists. No other part of the LXX-Torah nor of any other part of the Greek Bible has been handed down to us in manuscripts of Jewish origin<sup>3)</sup>. It was the *Church* which took over the older translations, and it was the *Church* which – in need of an authorized version of the whole OT – created what is now called the “LXX”, which is in reality mixed from different sources, composed of different translations. This accounts for the very different treatment of the texts: that they are now verbatim, now paraphrastic versions. *The Jewish LXX only consisted of the Torah*. But through this work of the Church the name “LXX” was attached to the whole Greek OT, and the legend of the Letter of *Aristeas* was told of the whole Greek OT of the Church.

*Kahle* proves his thesis by an abundance of evidence. He adduces the *quotations in Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament*, and explains their deviations from what is called the “LXX” on the ground that the authors also have used other Greek translations. An especially illuminating example, interesting to theologians, is drawn from the quotation in Mt. 12, 18–21. *Kahle* explains the discrepancies between Hebr. 9,3ff. and the Torah on the same lines: The author of Hebr. used a Torah which was more like the Samaritan text. A papyrus containing some verses from Job 33–34<sup>4)</sup> is of great importance. The different

<sup>1)</sup> above p. 68.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 80.

<sup>3)</sup> The *Chester-Beatty Papyri* also come from Christian writers, of the 2nd cent. A.D., cf. *F. Kenyon's* introduction to the ed. of Num. and Deut.

<sup>4)</sup> *Stegmüller*, in *Berliner Klassikertexte* VIII, 1939.



texts of the Book of Judges even in the eyes of *Lagarde*<sup>1)</sup> – who however was too obsessed by his idea of the “Urtext” to draw the right conclusions from his own premises – show that the *different manuscripts represent different translations*<sup>2)</sup>.

*Outside the Pentateuch, we must conclude, there has never existed a standard Jewish text of the Greek OT, but many different translations.* The original Jewish LXX, i.e. the Alexandrian standard version of the Torah for which the Letter of Aristeas makes propaganda, is a sort of parallel to the Targum Onkelos in this respect. But unlike this Targum, the LXX-Torah was later rejected by the Jews. But the Christian Church needed a canonical text of the whole OT. It generally, for this purpose, adopted only one of the Jewish texts. But before this selection of texts had been carried to and end, in the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D., the Church used different forms. Gradually however the Church got its standard text, and this canonical version was now called the “LXX”, a name derived from the Letter of Aristeas, but now extended to cover not only the Torah, as in the letter and in most Hellenistic Jewish authors, but the whole Greek OT. This extension of the term “LXX” took place in the 2nd century A.D. It is attested by *Irenaeus*, and Christian writers upon the whole used the Letter of Aristeas to underline the canonicity of the whole Greek OT.<sup>3)</sup>

The scholar of the Ancient Church who saw clearer than others concerning the problem of the “LXX”, *Kahle* says, was *Origen*. This learned theologian had a clear perception of the difficulties presented by the Greek Bible used in the Church of his day. He calls it the “LXX”, like all Christian authors of Antiquity. But unlike the Church Fathers, including *Augustine*<sup>4)</sup>, he did not attach to it any ideas of its miraculous origin and divine inspiration, which the Church found affirmed in the Letter of Aristeas. *Origen*’s own studies had shown him that the different Greek texts did not agree at all with one another<sup>5)</sup>. From controversies with the Jews he had observed the discrepancies between the “LXX” and the Hebrew text. From *Eusebius* we know that *Origen* was in possession of

<sup>1)</sup> cf. the quotations by *Kahle*, Schweich Lectures 1941, p. 156f.

<sup>2)</sup> “Codex B liefert nicht Varianten zu A, sondern enthält ... eine andere Uebersetzung des Buches der Richter”. Concerning *Philo*, cf. the discussion between *P. Katz*, *Philo’s Bible* (1950), and *Kahle*, *Die hebr. Handschriften aus der Höhle*, pp. 36ff.

<sup>3)</sup> See the article, quoted by *Kahle*, p. 158, of *P. Wendland* in *ZNTW* 1900, pp. 267–99.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Alexander Sperber*, in *Journal of Bibl. Lit.* 1940, pp. 210ff. *Kahle*, Schweich Lectures 1941, p. 159. <sup>5)</sup> *Kahle*, loc. cit.

*Hebrew manuscripts*<sup>1</sup>). He did not know that the Hebrew text too had a history of its own, so that the text which had been the basis of the translations was often not identical with the text regarded as canonical by the Jews of his own times. He therefore regarded the differences between his Hebrew text and the Greek translations as deteriorations of the original translation. The aim of his *Hexapla* was to repair this damage by comparison with the Hebrew text which he considered the original of the "Septuagint". His knowledge of Hebrew was however not sufficient to work directly on the Hebrew text, and so he made use of all sorts of Greek translations which he could lay his hands upon. Moreover, he had to be cautious: If he had spoken openly of his aims, he might have been accused of *heresy*. The "LXX" to his Church was a sacred book. In this light his words in his commentary on Matthew, referred to above, are to be understood<sup>2</sup>).

The Church needed a canonical text. Therefore we see in its history a movement parallel to that going on in Jewish circles: a tendency to exclude all texts differing from that which was considered the original "LXX". A most illuminating example of this *Kahle* draws from the quotation from Is. 42, 1ff. in Mt. 12, referred to, briefly, above. Not one manuscript of the Christian "LXX" supports the readings of Mt., except in a few cases where the OT text seems to have been influenced by the NT quotation. The Church suppressed all texts differing from its standard version. These texts were not copied and accordingly have disappeared, and the "LXX" prevailed so that it was very difficult for *Jerome* to obtain understanding for his reasons of his going back to the *Hebraica Veritas*.

Finally, *Kahle* gives his opinions upon the question which so strongly occupied *Lagarde* and his pupil *Rahlfs*: The reconstruction of the "Urtext" of the "LXX". This task *Kahle* declares to be an impossible work. *Lagarde* did not realize the necessary difference between editing an original text and editing a translation. "The editor of a dialogue of Plato must try to publish a text as closely connected as possible with the original written by the author himself. But a translation cannot be handled in this way. We may try to edit the Jewish standard text of the Greek Tora. But we cannot regard such a text as an

<sup>1</sup>) *Kahle* has proved that the "Quinta" and "Sexta" of *Origen* (cf. p. 78) must have been great manuscripts of Greek translations discovered by *Origen*, probably in Jewish genizas (op. cit., pp. 161-65); cf. Die hebr. Handschr. aus d. Höhle, pp. 32f.

<sup>2</sup>) Of special importance is the fact, proved by *Mercati* (*Studi e testi* V, Roma 1901, pp. 28-46 and 47-60) and *Schwartz*, *Zur Geschichte der Hexapla* (*Nachr. der Gött. Ges. d. Wissensch., Phil.-Hist. Kl.* 1903, Heft 6), that *Eusebius* in his relation of *Origen's* work had before him notes by *Origen* himself concerning the so-called "Quinta" and "Sexta" and how *Origen* had discovered them.



"Urtext". A standard text of a translation is always found at the end of the development, never at the beginning". This is proved abundantly by the examination of the manuscript material of e.g. the *Targumim*, the history of *Latin versions*, where the *Vulgate* is preceded by different forms of the *Vetus Latina*, and by the history of the *Syriac* version which has also had its predecessors. The same was the case with the *Jewish LXX*, the standard version of the Pentateuch praised and recommended in the Letter of Aristeas. And the "*LXX*" of the Church too had its predecessors. The search for an "Urtext" of the "*LXX*" is therefore bound to be a failure. The uniform text does not stand at the beginning, but at the end of the development. The different "*recensions*" of the Christian "*LXX*": *Lucian*, *Hesychius*, they too revisions of older versions, also are *traces of earlier texts* from times before the uniform ecclesiastical text had been established. This accounts e.g. for the so-called "proto-Lucianic" or "pre-Lucianic" readings (cf. above p. 79).

"The task which the Septuagint presents to scholars is not the "reconstruction" of an imaginary "Urtext", nor the discovery of it, but a careful collection and investigation of all the remains and traces of earlier versions of the Greek Bible which differed from the Christian standard text" – in these words *Kahle* sums up the results of his work in this field. His theories, here given only very briefly, must in my opinion be considered the base of every future work on the "*LXX*".

### *Manuscripts.*

The OT in Greek is represented in the well-known old codices famous in the textual history of the NT: the *Codex Vaticanus* (B), *Sinaiticus* (S or  $\aleph$ ) both of the 4th century A.D.: the *Codex Alexandrinus* (A), and the palimpsest *Codex Ephraemi Syri* (C) of the 5th century. What is to be said of these codices is generally given in the Introductions to the NT. The codices are not complete. But beside them we know several hundreds of manuscripts. The largest collection of variants was published by *Holmes-Parsons* (1827), from 311 manuscripts. But much more material has been added since then.

*Recent editions:* *Swete* (1st ed. 1887–91; vol. I in 4th ed. 1909; II–III in 3rd ed. 1905 and 1907). *Rahlfs* (1937). *Swete* prints the text of one manuscript and gives other readings in the apparatus. *Rahlfs* gives a reconstruction of the text which has perhaps never existed (cf. *Kahle* on the possibility of reconstructing an Urtext). *Greater editions* are published in Cambridge by *Brooke-MacLean-Thackeray* and by the Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. None of these are yet complete. *Older prints* are found in the *Complutensian Polyglot* and in *Editio Sixtina* 1587, the base of the very much used edition by *van Ess* (1824). On recently discovered material: *Winton Thomas*, in *The OT and Modern Study*, pp. 248ff.

*Literature:* Paul de Lagardes wissenschaftliches Lebenswerk (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, 4, 1) (1928), pp. 66–86. *Swete*,



Introduction to the OT in Greek, rev. by *Ottley* (1914). *Ottley*, A Handbook to the Septuagint (1920). *Thackeray*, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship (2nd ed. 1923); Some Aspects of the Greek OT (1927). *Field*, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt., I-II (1867-74). *Herrmann und Baumgärtel* (cf. p. 76). *Wutz* (cf. p. 74). *Kenyon*, Recent developments in the textual criticism of the Greek Bible (1933). *Bertram*, Zur Septuaginta-Forschung I-II, in Theologische Rundschau 1931, pp. 283-96, 1933, pp. 172-86, 1938, pp. 69ff., 133ff. *Kahle*, Schweich Lectures 1941. Die hebr. Handschr. aus der Höhle (1951). *P. Katz*, Philo's Bible (1950).

*C. H. Roberts*, Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library in Manchester (1936), cf. *Opitz* and *Schaefer* in ZNTW 1936, p. 115. *Hempel*, ZATW 1937, p. 115ff. *Gerleman*, Studies in the Septuagint I, The Book of Job (1946), II, Chronicles (1946). The Septuagint Proverbs as a Hellenistic Document (Oudtest. Stud. VIII); *Wevers*, Exegetical Principles underlying the LXX Text of 1 Kings II 12-XXI 43 (ibid.); on 22,1-2 Ki. 25,30, in Cath. Bibl. Quart. 1952, pp. 40ff.

### *Translations derived from the "LXX".*

According to the preceding paragraph the superscription to the following section certainly ought to be rather: *Translations based on Greek translations*. Many of them differ considerably from what is commonly called "LXX", and probably they sometimes rest on translations now lost. We cannot be sure that the translations into Latin and other languages, based on Greek translations, always rest on the "LXX" of the Church. What is to be said of "Lucianic" and other readings in those works must confirm this. At least, when Christianity spread to parts of the world where Greek was not understood, the Bible had to be translated into the local idiom. And here *Kahle's* picture of the development of the Hebrew text, the Targumim, the "LXX", the Syriac version, is due to repeat itself: We have at the outset a multiplicity of versions, developing towards uniformity and standard texts. That is certainly the case with the versions which we shall have to consider first.

### *The Vetus Latina.*

The so-called Vetus Latina version originated in North Africa (*Carthage*). In the native land of *Tertullian* the Latin language was from the beginning the language of the Church. Here the Church met both Punic and Latin culture, and here the Greek Bible was translated at an early time. Quotations of such translations are found in the works of *Cyprian* (d. 258). Words of *Augustine* (*De civitate Dei* XVIII; *De doctrina chr.* II, 16 and 22<sup>1)</sup>) show that he knew several translations, but that he preferred one called "*Itala*". It is however a question if he has not made a mistake and regarded different manuscripts as different

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Steuernagel*, p. 146.

translations, and if "Itala" is not a scribal error or signifies a translation by *Jerome*<sup>1)</sup>. But most probably we here have a situation analogous to that supposed by *Kahle* concerning the Targumim and the "LXX": The beginning was made in several places, e.g. also in *Rome* (somewhat later than in Carthage), so that several Latin translations were in existence. And this multiplicity has then been replaced by more and more uniformity<sup>2)</sup>.

The *North African* texts exhibit some connections with the so-called recension of *Lucianus* (cf. p. 79). Dependence upon a common "primitive *Lucianus*" is assumed, but not certain<sup>3)</sup>. As mentioned above, *Lucian* probably revised an earlier version, different from the translation ultimately accepted by the Church<sup>4)</sup>.

The confusion in the Latin versions was accordingly similar to that in the field of the "LXX"<sup>5)</sup>. This led to the creation of the *Vulgate*, based on the Hebrew text, which will be mentioned in due time below. This version of *Jerome* after some time completely superseded the older Latin translations from the Greek versions, inclusive a *revision* undertaken by *Jerome* himself, before he set to work on his new translation. Of this earlier revision of the Latin version the *Psalterium Gallicanum*, founded on the *Hexapla*, which *Jerome* had seen in Caesarea during his second journey to the Orient, and a revision of *Job*, have been preserved. Besides, the old Latin version which he revised, is still found in certain of the *Apocrypha* and in his translation of the NT in the *Vulgate*<sup>6)</sup>.

The fragments of the Old Latin translations have been edited in 1739-49, and in a new edition in 1751, by *Sabatier*: *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae. New Ed.* 1949 ff.

*Rönsch*, *Itala und Vulgata* (2nd ed. 1875). *Burkitt*, *The Old Latin and the Itala* (Texts and Studies 4, 3 - 1896); *St. Augustine's Bible and the Itala* (Journ. of Theol. Stud. 1910, pp. 258-68); *Itala Problems* (Amelli Congratulation Volume, Badia di Montecassino, 1920, pp. 25-41, quoted by *Eissfeldt*). *Denk*, *Der neue Sabatier und sein wissenschaftliches Programm* (1914). *Allgeier*, *Die altlateinischen Psalterien* (1928); *Lehrreiche Fehler in den altlateinischen Psalterien* (Biblische Zeitschr. 1929, pp. 271-93). *Lagrange*, *De quelques opinions sur l'ancien psautier latin* (Revue Biblique 1932, pp. 161-86).

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Steuernagel*.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. the survey of *Jülicher*, in RGG, 2nd ed. I, cols. 104ff.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Steuernagel*, p. 57.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 176.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. *Jülicher*, op. cit.

<sup>6)</sup> *Jülicher*.

### *The Coptic Translations.*

The word "Copts" is the signification of the *native Egyptians* who had become Christians. The name is an *Arabic* distortion (*al Kubi*) of Greek *Aigyptos*. The *Coptic* language is the conversation-language of these Egyptians, a very young form of the Egyptian language. Its development begins in the 3rd century A.D., when it replaces the Greek language of the upper classes in Hellenistic Egypt. It is written in *Greek letters*, the Greek alphabet being supplemented by 7 signs taken over from the Egyptian script. The Coptic language is divided into a series of *dialects*: 1) The *Sa'idic* (Theban), and the *Achmimian* in Upper Egypt; 2) the *Fayyumic* and the *Memphitic* in Middle Egypt; 3) the *Bohairic* in the Western Delta, *Alexandria* and its environs. In all these dialects there exist translations, commonly supposed to be based on the "LXX". Perhaps it would be more cautious to speak more vaguely of *Greek versions*. They are considered affiliated to the "recension" of *Hesychius* (cf. p. 80).

*Literature:* *Vaschalde*, Ce qui a été publié des versions coptes de la Bible (1922), cf. *Revue Biblique* 1919-22. *Hallock*, The Coptic OT (*American Journal of Semitic Languages* 1933, pp. 325ff.). More Literature in RGG, 2nd ed., s. v. Koptische Literatur. A critical edition of the OT is being prepared.

### *The Ethiopic translation.*

In the 4th century Syrian missionaries, according to tradition, brought the Gospel to *Ethiopia*<sup>1</sup>). Several scholars therefore think that the version of the Bible which became current in this country must be derived from the Syriac "recension" of the "LXX", which is connected with the presbyter *Lucian* (cf. p. 79). But this cannot be established as a fact, the oldest manuscripts, the age of which is given in different ways, being very corrupt. But *Littmann* thinks himself authorized, nevertheless, to conclude that the translation was created by *Semites* who understood *Greek*. In the 14th century a revision took place, but it was hardly founded on the Hebrew text, more probably on the Arabic translation of *Saadya* (cf. p. 72). There have also been later revisions.

*Editions* by *Dillmann* (Gen. - 2 Ki., and the Apocrypha, 1853, 1871, 1894), and by *Littmann*, in *Bibliotheca Abessinica* (Gen. (1909), Ex. and Lev. 1911).

*Hengstenberg* in RGG, 2nd ed. I, col. 1046.

<sup>1</sup>) *Littmann*, in RGG, 2nd ed. I, col. 56.



*Other translations based upon Greek texts.*

Among other translations derived from the Greek, in *Arabic*, *Syriac*, (different from the Peshitta), *Armenian*, *Georgian*, and *Slavic*, the *Syro-Hexaplaris* of *Paul from Tella* (cf. p. 79) must be mentioned. Of special fame in Northern parts of Europe is the *Gothic* translation of *Ulfilas* from ca. 350 A.D., of which important fragments are preserved in the *Codex Argenteus* in Uppsala in Sweden (photographic reproduction from 1927); of the OT not much is left.

*Independent Greek translations.*

*Aquila.*

In the 1st century A.D. the LXX (i. e. the Alexandrian Jewish translation of the *Law*) more and more becomes suspect among the Jews (cf. pp. 77 and 82). The revision of the Hebrew text after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. made it clear that it differed from the standard Palestinian text. Therefore the Greek speaking Jews attempted to replace it by more orthodox translations. The dominating tendency of the time, represented by the synod of *Jamnia* and later by rabbi *Akiba* (cf. p. 69 and p. 77), was that the translation ought to be as literal as possible. The beginnings of the work of the massoretes (cf. pp. 56ff.) was accounted for by the interest in the correct tradition of the Hebrew text, and this interest was the cause of the form of the new translations which endeavoured to give a verbatim rendering of the Hebrew text. Therefore the LXX was repudiated (cf. p. 82)<sup>1</sup>). The demands of the new tendencies were met by the translation of *Aquila*. It was an independent rendering of the Hebrew text. *Aquila*, according to *Epiphanius* (*De mens. et pond.* 14ff.), was a proselyte from *Sinope* in *Pontus*, by marriage related to the emperor *Hadrian*<sup>2</sup>). Jewish tradition, too, calls him a proselyte, and tells that he was a disciple of several rabbis, especially *Akiba*. This information is corroborated by *Jerome* in his commentary on Is. 8, 14<sup>3</sup>). Accordingly he should have lived ca. 130 A.D. His translation, of which fragments have been preserved, is also of the same spirit as the orthodoxy of

<sup>1</sup>) As late as 553 A.D. a *novella* by *Justinian I* orders the "LXX" to be used in the Jewish service (*Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 24). This seems to be a government measure, trying to force the Bible of the Church into the service of the synagogue. This is affirmed by the strongly apologetical tone in the words of the *novella* recommending the "LXX", (see *Kahle's* translation of the *novella*, op. cit., p. 34, where the use of *Aquila* is permitted as an act of grace of the emperor).

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Steuernagel*, p. 48.

<sup>3</sup>) *Steuernagel*, loc. cit. – The *novella* of *Justinian I* quoted in n. 1 also alludes to his "foreign race". – cf. *Liebermann*, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (1942), pp. 17ff.

*Akiba*, characterized by the theory of *literal inspiration* (cf. p. 77). *Aquila* sacrifices the Greek usage to a slavish word to word rendering of the Hebrew text.

He renders *'eth* by *syn* when the article is following; if not, *'eth* is translated by the Greek article.<sup>1)</sup> *gam* is rendered *kalge*, *w'gam*: *kal kalge*; *lemor*: *tô légein*; *l'min*: *eis apó*. He imitates the *Hebrew etymology* in his translations, e.g. he renders *'esem*: *ostéo*, and accordingly *'issem*: *osteóin*, *'āsūm*: *ostéinos*; or *māgen*: *thyreón* and accordingly *naggen*: *thyreóin*.

This does not mean that he is ignorant of Greek; on the contrary, he masters Greek brilliantly. This is proved by his use of rare expressions and poetical phrases<sup>2)</sup>. But his aim is to give expression to the minutest details, to which the Jewish exegetes attached importance. He therefore was highly esteemed, not only among the Jews of his day, but also among Christian Scholars like *Origen* and *Jerome* who benefited greatly from his accuracy. Until 1897 his translation was only known through a few quotations and from some fragments of the *Hexapla*. But the *geniza* of *Old Cairo* has also supplied us with new material for the understanding of *Aquila*<sup>3)</sup>: Some palimpsests containing his translation of 1 Ki. 20,9-17 and 2 Ki. 23,12-17, fragments of Ps. 93-103, and a *Hexaplaric* fragment of Ps. 22. Recently numerous pieces have been discovered of his translation of *Isaiah*.

*Literature*: *Field*, *Originis Hexaplorum* etc. (cf. p. 86), I, 2, p. XVI-XLII. *Burkitt*, *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila* (1897). *Taylor*, *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Geniza Palimpsests* (1900). *Silverstone*, *Aquila and Onkelos* (1931). *Möhle*, *Ein neuer Fund zahlreicher Stücke aus den Jesajaübersetzungen des Akylas, Symmachus und Theodotion* (ZATW 1934, pp. 176 ff.).

Concerning the relations between *Aquila* and the *Targum Onkelos*, cf. also p. 69. *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures 1941*, pp. 117ff.; *Die hebr. Handschr. aus der Höhle*, pp. 33f., 43.

According to *McNeile*, *An Introduction to Ecclesiastes* (1904), the "LXX" of *Eccl.* should be *Aquila*.<sup>4)</sup>

### Theodotion.

The author of the so-called "translation" of *Theodotion* according to *Irenaeus* (III, 21,1)<sup>5)</sup> was a proselyte. *Epiphanius* (*De mens. et pond.* 17) says that like

<sup>1)</sup> *Rahlfs*, in the *Prolegomena* to the edition of *Gen.* in the great Göttingen-LXX, ed. by the Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1927, p. 10.

<sup>2)</sup> *Steuernagel*, loc. cit.

<sup>3)</sup> *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures 1941*, p. 13. Great fragments are also extant in the material of *Mercati* from the Ambrosiana of Milan, best known for its remains of *Hexaplaric* material. These texts are younger than the *geniza*-fragments.

<sup>4)</sup> *Steuernagel*, p. 49.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. *Rahlfs*, in the *Prolegomena* to the edition of *Gen.*, p. 11f. against the theory of an "Ur-Theodotion", earlier than Paul and John (1 Cor. 15,54 and John 19,37). But cf. our following remarks above.

*Aquila* he came from *Pontus*, and was a pupil of *Marcion*. Under *Commodus* (180-193) he is said to have been converted to the Jewish faith. *Jerome* in his preface to *Dan.* reports him to be an *Ebionite*. All these reports are completely uncertain. Already *Jerome* found his translation related to the "LXX" and it is best regarded as a *revision* of a Greek Targum<sup>1</sup>). It is preserved in fragments of the *Hexapla* and above all in *Dan.* where it has superseded the "LXX". It very often does not translate the Hebrew words, but only transcribes them. The Jews have shown no interest in it, while the Church has valued it highly.

The problem is in reality here the same as concerning the "*Lucianic*" recension (cf. p. 85): "*Theodotionic*" readings are found in writings earlier than the date of the usual "*Theodotion*" (in the NT, *Barnabas*, *Clement Rom.*, *Hermas*, *Irenaeus* and *Tertullian*<sup>2</sup>). The solution offered by *Kahle* is the most probable: *Theodotion* revised one of the many Greek translations of the OT, different from the forms used in the "LXX" of the Church.

Concerning the relations between the name *Theodotion* and the Targumic title *Jonathan*, cf. p. 70f. - *Kahle*, *Die hebr. Handschr. aus der Höhle*, pp. 33,43.

### Symmachus.

A third Greek translation, dating from the beginning of the 3rd century, is the so-called translation of *Symmachus*. According to *Eusebius* (*Hist. eccl.* VI, 17) and *Jerome* (*De vir. illustr.* 54) he was an *Ebionite*, according to *Epiphanius* (*De mens. et pond.* 15) a *Samaritan* who in the days of the emperor *Severus* (193-211) was converted to Judaism. The *Talmud*<sup>3</sup>) mentions one *Swmkws* as a disciple of rabbi *Me'ir* (ca. 200). In his commentary on *Amos* 3,11 *Jerome* remarks that *Symmachus* did not pay attention to a strictly literal rendering of the Hebrew text, but tried to present a translation into good Greek. The few preserved fragments (from the *Hexapla*) confirm this. Besides he endeavoured to avoid anthropomorphisms<sup>4</sup>).

*Kahle*, *Die hebr. Handschr. aus der Höhle*, pp. 33,43.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. T.W. *Manson*, *Dominican Studies* II (1949), pp. 183ff. *F. Kenyon*, *The Chester-Beatty Biblical Papyri ... fasc. VII* (1937), p. X, cf. also *Montgomery*, *Commentary on Daniel* (*Intern. Crit. Comm.* 1927), pp. 46-50. *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 168f., *Die hebr. Handschr. aus der Höhle*, pp. 33ff.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. the previous note.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Steuernagel*, p. 49.

<sup>4</sup>) *Steuernagel*, p. 50, gives examples from *Gen.* 1,27 and *Ex.* 24,10.



## Quinta, Sexta, Septima.

By these words are signified a couple of anonymous translations which *Origen* used in his work on the Hexapla. *Kahle* makes it probable that they are remains of older Jewish texts<sup>1</sup>).

Concerning other Greek translations, cf. the short review of *Steuernagel*, p. 50.

*Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 161f. and 179; *Die hebr. Handschriften aus der Höhle*, pp. 32ff.

*The Vulgate.*

Being a translation directly from the *Hebrew* text, at any rate for the greater part (cf. above p. 87), the *official translation of the Roman Church* has independent importance as a witness to the text of the OT.

Its origin lies in the full light of history. It is the result of the *appeal of the pope Damasus to Jerome to revise the Latin translation of the Bible*. The learned, and not very amiable, Father originally despised the Hebrew language as barbarian and took up the study of it as an ascetic exercise after his settlement at *Bethlehem* in 386. His translation he began in 390 with Sam.-Kings, to which his important *Prologus galeatus* is written, and he finished his work in 405 A.D. His aim was to give an accurate rendering into good Latin of the original text, with careful attention to the *Vetus Latina*. He also consulted both Greek translations and information given by rabbis.

As a novelty his translation had to fight hard to gain a footing in the Church. Not even his friend *Augustine* would have anything to do with the *Hebraica veritas*, and after the death of pope *Damasus*, *Jerome's* protector, the translation had no longer the favour and support of ecclesiastical authorities<sup>2</sup>). But little by little it conquered its antagonists, and from the 7th century it found favour with the Church. Only for the *Psalter*, the *Psalterium Gallicanum* was still used (cf. p. 87). During the Middle Ages the translation of *Jerome* became the "*Vulgate*", i.e. "the common". But "*Itala*" dominates the field of the Apocrypha and the NT, while the "*LXX*" is the basis of the translation of the Psalms.

At an early date already the text has suffered from *textual corruption*, and accordingly had to be revised rather often. The *Synod of Trent* in 1546 resolved that a *new edition* had to be published. This was done in 1590 under pope *Sixtus V*, after whom the edition was called *Sixtina*. But the Jesuits used their influence and had it rejected (it was not quite without errors), and pope *Clement VIII* had a new edition arranged, the *Clementina* of 1592. It contained many

<sup>1</sup>) cf. above, p. 84, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup>) *Jülicher*, in *RGG*, 2nd ed. I, col. 1042. Cf. above, p. 83, n. 3 on *Augustine's* controversy with *Jerome*.

misprints which were corrected in reprints from 1593 and 1598. These Clementine editions were proclaimed normative, in spite of their differences which were regarded as unessential.

*Editions:* Gramatica: Bibliorum sacrorum juxta Vulgatam Clementinam Nova Editio (1922). Hetzenauer (1922). Since 1926 a great edition is under publication according to the command of pope Pius XI, cf. Stummer, ZATW 1927, pp. 141-150. The translation of the Psalms of Jerome has been published by Lagarde (1874).

*Literature:* Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate (1893). Aman, Die Vulgata Sixtina von 1590 (1912). Stummer, Einleitung in die lateinische Bibel (1928); Beih. ZATW 1936, pp. 233ff.

### *Helps to textual criticism inside the different witnesses.*

The different witnessess of the text, the Hebrew text, the Greek and other versions, should (cf. p. 65) serve as means to find an "original text". The examination on the previous pages has however shown that each of the witnesses in their turn present problems of textual criticism which have to be solved before they can be used in the service of the ultimate task of textual criticism. We must of course underline that the goal of criticism, to find an "original text", is an ideal which never can be attained. And the examination of the history of the text demonstrates to our eyes that we are farther from it than ever. The different witnesses appear to represent different, often widely different forms of the text. The Massoretical text, the "LXX", the Peshitta etc., all have behind them a long story where multiplicity little by little is replaced by uniformity by a sort of survival of the fittest, a process of selection, during which many forms of the text disappear, until the present compromises are reached. But still it must also be remembered that in spite of this multiplicity the Old Testament is essentially the same in its different forms.

But before we proceed to give a brief sketch of the text and its fate, and of the methods of textual criticism, we still – under the heading "witnesses to the text" – have to call attention to *elements for the determination of the text inside the texts themselves*, inside the Massoretical text, inside the "LXX" etc.

We must however remember what was said above concerning the results of Kahle's work. Probably in all cases it will be impossible to reconstruct an "Urtext". We can aim at the determination of one or more different "standard texts". This is true not only of the translations, but also of the Hebrew text.<sup>1)</sup> But here we must consider the problem raised by *oral tradition*, which developed into may have different written forms. The differences between

<sup>1)</sup> cf. Mowinkel, in Norsk Teol. Tidsskr. 1951, p. 162 on the prophetic books: "There was no "Urtext", nor a definite or dominating form of text".

the Hebrew text and the Greek versions concerning the arrangement of the material in the books (Kings and Jeremiah, e.g.) are of importance in this connection, and here are several unsolved problems.

But inside the texts themselves we also have helps for reconstruction. Of this kind are the *texts occurring more than once*. Sections of this kind naturally help to determine the text, one of the texts perhaps being clear, the other corrupt. A form of this aid is *parallelism*. On the other hand, the *rhythm* is no reliable servant of textual criticism, because in spite of the work of *Sievers* and others we are still, in fact, groping, perhaps not in darkness, but rather in twilight, concerning Hebrew metrics. But with these considerations we are getting into the questions of the technique of textual criticism which we shall sketch briefly in the following paragraphs.

### THE ORIGINAL TEXT AND ITS FATE

The witnesses of the text mentioned above do not contain the text in its original form. As *Steuernagel* remarks<sup>1)</sup> this thesis can be put forward quite a priori, a longer space of time always being interposed between the witnesses and the origin of a single book. No Biblical book has come down to our times in the original manuscripts. Not the greatest care could prevent errors of copyists from dropping in. Further, Antiquity, not being governed by our ideas of *literary ownership*, gave the proprietor of a manuscript power of life and death over it, and accordingly the proprietor could make additions, corrections, omissions in his book. This arbitrariness is counterbalanced when a book ceases to be purely private property, when the books are regarded as *holy*. This must have happened to OT books comparatively early. Already the redactors of the Pentateuch must have considered themselves bound – at least to a certain degree – to the text in the sources which they combine. But in this situation too there are sources of errors. Copyists detect errors, or they assume on the base of opinions of their own that the text cannot be correct, and therefore venture on conjectures which are far from always correct.

These a priori considerations are confirmed by the actual state of the text. In many cases the texts do not agree with one another. If we – with *Steuernagel* – take an example of the kind mentioned in the previous paragraph, viz. pieces handed down in parallel recensions inside the Hebrew text, then we see that the *Decalogue* has been transmitted in two forms with slight differences showing that none of them is the original text. The same is seen in the different forms of the *Books of the Kings* or *Jeremiah* in the Massoretic text and the “LXX”.

<sup>1)</sup> p. 71.



*Kahle* has proved that even the *Torah* was of different forms in different circles.<sup>1)</sup> We should consider such important, holy texts untouchable, but we must admit the fact that Antiquity handled them with more freedom so far as their form is concerned, until we get down to times like the last quarter of the 1st century A.D. and the beginning of the 2nd when Judaism gets the notion of verbal inspiration (cf. p. 77). In earlier times it was sufficient that the contents were the same. If we should give a picture of *Jeremiah* on the base of "LXX" we should get essentially the same idea of the prophet as from the recension of the Massoretic text. It is of importance to underline this against modern scepticism, mostly outside the circles of scholars familiar with the problems, concerning Biblical tradition. And it is also worth noting that the witnesses to the text very widely agree.

The previous chapters on the history of the text have shown that it is not improbable that one "original text" has never existed but only variants of the traditional books. In this connection the modern theories of the significance of *oral tradition* come in (cf. the *Appendix* and above, pp. 84f.).

#### *Textual Criticism.*

The goal of textual criticism can accordingly only be the reconstruction of different forms of tradition., fixed in writing<sup>2)</sup>.

*Steuernagel* is right when he draws attention to the fact that this is not so practically taught through rules in a handbook as by good examples, by practical work. As good examples of this kind *Eissfeldt*<sup>3)</sup> refers to a couple of classical works as e.g. *Wellhausen's* *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (1871) and *Cornill's* *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (1886). Such examples must of course not be taken as an assertion of the eternal validity of all the results of these books. Later years have made us more trustful towards the tradition of the Massoretic text over against e.g. the "LXX". As classical works I should further mention the works of the great *British* scholars, the eminent *S. R. Driver*, e.g. his masterpiece *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (2nd ed. 1913), and the NT scholars, *Westcott*, *Hort*, and *Lightfoot*. In modern times, many have felt that *H. S. Nyberg* in his *Studien zum Hoseabuche*, with the significant sub-title: *Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Klärung des Problems der alttestamentlichen Textkritik* (1935), has given much new

<sup>1)</sup> Schweich Lectures 1941, pp. 140ff.

<sup>2)</sup> The only modern European *Introd.* which treats the questions of textual criticism and its methods briefly, is the *Einleitung* of *Steuernagel*. A more elaborate monograph is *An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament*, by *J. Kennedy*, ed. by *N. Levison* (1928); *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet* I, p. 28ff.; cf. *Noth*, *Die Welt des Alten Testaments* (1946), pp. 233ff.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 718f.

inspiration. The fact that in my country this has not been felt as so epoch-making as e.g. in Germany and in Nyberg's native country, Sweden, is perhaps due to the moderation with which the school of *Frants Buhl* in Denmark treated textual criticism. In Germany the influence of the tendency governing classical philology, indulging in conjectures, was very strong, as is seen in the commentaries of *Marti* and *Duhm*, in the quite unmethodical works of *Sellin* and others. In Denmark the commission which translated the old Testament for the Danish Bible Society (the version of 1931) was much under the influence of this tendency through the disciple of *Duhm*, the Rev. *Ryge Jensen*. But the university teachers have always been very sceptical towards this school. Therefore the book of *Nyberg* has not seemed so unusual to us. And perhaps some of us are driving the reaction against the sport of making conjectures too far<sup>1</sup>).

We may briefly give some *general rules*.

We may presuppose that *an OT author cannot have written a text which is absolutely devoid of meaning. Grammatical usage and the contents may so be taken into consideration*. In certain cases therefore it is possible to presume that the text cannot have been handed down in the original form. The necessary presumption is however that all-out efforts have been made to understand the meaning. From the context, on the other hand, we generally can infer something concerning the positive problem: what must the text in question originally have said?

Where the versions give a translation differing from the Massoretic text and from each other it is not legitimate to conclude straightway that there is uncertainty concerning the "original text". This is a rule which is underlined by the modern higher valuation of the Massoretic text. It is not at all certain that a translator would give a literal rendering, or he may have translated wrongly, or the translations may be corrupt. They may not have understood the Hebrew text. Through an exact study of the method of the translation we must get a clear idea of the ways in which its author would translate in different cases. But our present insight into the history of the texts allows us to suppose that the translator can be dependent upon another tradition than our MT.

The witnesses have not all the same value. The "daughter translations" of the "LXX" e.g. have not the same value as the "LXX" itself. The problematic character of the "LXX" in itself makes this translation less valuable:

<sup>1</sup>) *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet I* (Uppsala 1945), in some cases gives his readers a somewhat inaccurate impression, as if this reaction were mostly represented by himself and his colleagues. A note to this effect concerning a passage from the Danish edition of my Introduction (*Engnell*, p. 78, note 1) is quite misleading as to my position in this problem.



It seems to represent several different translations (cf. above, pp. 80ff.). When a witness is influenced by another (cf. cases where e.g. a Greek translation has influenced the Peshitta, cf. p. 73) the rendering of the two translators cannot be counted as a double but only as a single witness. Old witnesses are generally of greater value than younger texts. In the case of translations it is also necessary to ascertain if they have a good or a bad manuscript as their foundation.

In cases of doubt, where we must choose between several well attested, independent readings, it is not always the reading which corresponds best to the context which is the original. We have to take into account that it may have originated just in order to get a "better" meaning, according to the translator or some copyist. In textual criticism accordingly we often have to use the rule that the most difficult reading is the right one (the rule of the *lectio difficilior*). In many cases this is sound work, but of course the rule has not to be handled in a doctrinaire way. Here as always practice makes perfect.

If there are several well attested readings which are interdependent we have to regard the one as the most original which in the most natural way explains the origin of the others. Sometimes all attested readings can be explained from a common source.

Pure conjecture (cf. above) is not justified until all witnesses are seen to have failed<sup>1)</sup>. They always have to be kept inside boundaries set by changes of the text (cf. below, pp. 98ff.) which we are able to know have certainly taken place. It is e.g. justified to assume that letters have been transposed when we are able to prove that this occurs pretty regularly. Books which are known to be badly transmitted give more justification for the assumption of errors than books which are well preserved. It is always a good rule to write the preserved text down over or below the assumed conjecture, in order to see if the picture of the script preserved looks like that of the conjecture. We also must draw attention to the sources of errors emanating from the similarity of letters in the different alphabets.

Methodical correction of a text is an art which presupposes profound knowledge of textual history, and the language in which the text is written. Against dilettantism in emending the text too strong a warning cannot be given.

<sup>1)</sup> In a discussion between two colleagues this rule was mentioned by one of them. The other retorted drily: "And then, too, it is best not to use it". His paradox (the other had said: "We must not use conjectures unless it is absolutely necessary") contains the great and important truth, that we always run the risk of introducing a new error by conjecture, and that conjectures generally are quite useless to the historian, because it is never justified to infer any conclusions from conjectures, at least without noting that the conclusion is another conjecture!



In his Gamla testamentet I, Engnell (p. 33, n. 1) gives some examples of evidently correct conjectures: In Amos 6,12b we had better read, in accordance with the context, *babbākār jān* for *babbekārim* (Michaelis). As the other example he mentions Is. 5,26 where we have to read *laggōj mērāhōk*, with assumption of dittography, instead of *laggōjīm mērāhōk*<sup>1)</sup>. Among the certain conjectures I should also have mentioned Bertholet's to Ps. 2,11b-12a, where the letters have been transposed with the result that an Aramaic word for "son" turns up in a quite awkward manner. On the other hand I cannot share Engnell's joy at his discovery that Ps. 32,4 does not need emendation (p. 23, n. 1): He proposes to translate: "My oil-cake is turned in the heat of summer" – which is assumed to mean: "My soul is consumed like the oil-cake which is dried up by the summer-heat". I know what it means to "turn" a pancake, but I do not understand how to "turn it in the summer-heat". A pancake is turned in the pan over the fire. To translate *nehpak*, "is changed" will be of no help, for the oil-cake is not changed, it is only dried up. I am a great admirer of people who can stick to the traditional consonant text. But here I think I should not do it.

*Literature:* Besides the paragraph of Steuernagel and the book of Kennedy, cf. also Th. C. Vriezen, in Inleiding tot de Theologische Studie, samengesteld door de Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen (1946), pp. 23ff.

### *Common changes in the text.*

By "changes in the text" we do not think of what is called "*formal changes*"<sup>2)</sup>: the change from the use of one alphabet to another, or the change from the use of scrolls to codices, bipartition of books, separation of words or sections, vocalisation and accentuation etc. We allude by this expression to the *material changes* which have happened in the course of time and which affect the meaning of the text.

First we refer to the fact that most Biblical books are the works of *redactors* or *compilers* who, in spite of their fidelity to their sacred books, or sometimes even because of their loyalty, have encroached upon the books which they had to care for. This cannot with certainty be distinguished from the *errors of copyists and scribes*.

Many changes are *unintentional*. To these belong the mistakes of letters mentioned p. 46f., caused by the alphabets in use, especially in dirty and damaged manuscripts where the copyist had to make conjectures. Even in inscriptions in stone it may be very difficult to distinguish between a *daleth* and a *resh*<sup>3)</sup>. In addition, as we have mentioned, the *scriptio continua* may bring about a wrong separation of words and sentences, and even a wrong separation of entire sections. And the text may contain *abbreviations* which were not intel-

<sup>1)</sup> Engnell in his text has a mistake: He says that he wants to assume the reading *laggōj minmerhak*, but this does not imply assumption of dittography (cf. Kittel's 3rd. ed.).

<sup>2)</sup> Steuernagel, pp. 74ff. – <sup>3)</sup> In the *Dead Sea Scrolls* these letters are easily distinguished, but e.g. not waw and yōch (cf. Millar Burrows, BASOR, Dec. 1951, pp. 18ff.).

ligible to the copyist, or he assumed abbreviations where they did not really occur.

Other errors are caused by *carelessness* of the copyist, e.g. *transposition of letters*, cf. the examples given by *Steuernagel*<sup>1)</sup>, Judg. 2,9, cf. Jos. 24,30: ḥrs for srḥ; Deut. 31,1, cf. LXX (wjlk, wjkl). Letters or words are skipped over, or more than should be there is written. One letter or a group of letters is written twice (*dittography*), or two identical letters only once (*haplography*)<sup>2)</sup>. Errors are also caused by the so-called *homoiooteleuton*: The eye of the copyist accidentally flitted from a word to a place farther on in the text where the same word is repeated, and so the words between the two identical words are omitted. Further confusion may then arise when omitted letters, words or sections are re-introduced in the text by later copyists, in the margin or between the lines<sup>3)</sup>. They then may be interpolated in wrong places. An example of homoiooteleuton is found e.g. in 1 Sam. 14,41, where "LXX" has preserved the missing section.

Other errors were caused through the *dictation* of the texts to copyists who did not hear exactly what was said (*errors of the ear*). Examples of this are the frequent mistake of *aleph* and *hē*, and upon the whole confusion of the *gut-turals*, e.g. also the frequent exchanging of the prepositions 'al and 'el.

Further, a whole list of parallels between Kings and Chron. prove that it has been possible to *replace an expression* by another one of the same or a similar meaning; and other quotations might prove that sometimes an expression was supplemented and so developed into a well-known favourite phrase. Texts are filled up from parallel sections.

*Variants* have often been noted in the margin and then interpolated in the text by later copyists.

Besides such more or less unconscious alterations, also *changes made on purpose* occur. To this class belong *explanatory glosses*, which generally are missing in parallel texts, where they occur, or in other witnesses of the text, or are recognizable by being in prose in the midst of a poetical context. *Doxologies* often have been added at the end of books or certain sections.

Sometimes arbitrary alterations of this kind really *change the meaning of the text or aim at determining its historical origin*. The text is supplemented according

<sup>1)</sup> p. 80.

<sup>2)</sup> *Haplography* sometimes seems to arise from a sort of *abbreviation*, "since both of two identical letters immediately following one another, even in different words, do not seem to have been necessarily always written" (cf. *Torczyner*, Lachish I, 3,9; 6,12; 12,3 and other possible examples; *Delitzsch*, Lese- und Schreibfehler, p. 84-85)". (G. R. Driver, in *Journal of Theol. Studies* 1946, o. 148). - <sup>3)</sup> cf. examples in the *Dead Sea Scrolls*.



to parallels or on *dogmatic* grounds: *promises* are added to prophetic books according to the scheme of "bad luck-good luck", or the traditional author of a section is given in a superscription. In such cases the determination of the authenticity is very difficult, and e.g. in the question of the "genuineness" of prophetic promises the older criticism was often too dogmatic in its inclination to explain all promises of a better future as post-exilic interpolations. In this respect a sound reaction has set in — and is perhaps beginning to arrive at the opposite extremity of dogmatism.

That a passage has been *filled up* from a parallel section can be recognized by the literal or nearly literal conformity between the two sections in question. The *priority* can, if other criteria are not found, often be recognized through misunderstandings in the secondary section. But the difficulty is that such misunderstandings in their turn can be copyist's errors and accordingly without significance for the question of priority.

In some passages sections seem to have been *omitted*, e.g. Ex. 33,6, where v. 7 presupposes that the making of the Ark of the Covenant has been mentioned just before this verse, cf. also abrupt conclusions as Gen. 35,22a.

Real corrections of the text are the so-called *tiḳḱunē-sōfērīm* (cf. p. 57). But they are only one sure evidence for the fact that tendency has caused corrections. Of course we cannot in detail account for the alterations caused by the contrast between the syncretism of the old Israelitic age and the *Yahwistic* "censure" which has given the OT its particular character<sup>1)</sup>. In general this is more than a problem of purely textual criticism. But we should note that e.g. the textual corruption of Ps. 110,3 <sup>2)</sup> certainly must be due to a Yahwistic reaction against the too Canaanite ideas expressed in the original text, to which the versions still give some evidence. — In some passages religious reverence for the God of Israel and more lofty ideas of God in later ages have led to corrections. *Euphemisms* are introduced. In Job 1,11 and 2,5,9 the text says "to bless Yahweh" instead of the original "curse". In Lev. 24,11 the word "The Name" has been introduced in accord with later custom to replace "Yahweh" by this word (cf. the vocalisation of the tetragrammaton in manuscripts older than the 11th century). To the same category belongs the "Elohistic" redaction of the 2nd book of the Psalms. — The names of *foreign gods* are obliterated, and the reading *bošet* introduced for *Baal*, also in proper names originally composed with the latter divine name, cf. Rom. 11,4 where Baal gets the feminine article because the Greek equivalent of *bošet* is

<sup>1)</sup> cf. Engnell, Gamla testamentet I, pp. 46f., 145.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. my commentary on the Psalms (1939), ad. loc. Widengren, in Festschrift utgiven av Teologiska Fakulteten i Uppsala 1941 (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1941, 7, 1), p. 4.



feminine (cf. LXX). In such cases *Chron.* has often preserved the original Canaanite word, probably because the canonization of *Chron.* took place very late<sup>1</sup>). Sometimes both the original reading and the later correction stand beside one another e.g. Gen. 18,6, where the ritually correct *solet* stands beside the original *kemah*.

### Conclusion.

Many instances show, according to what has been said, that texts have suffered corruptions in the course of the centuries. But as emphasized above: it never has touched religiously, or rather theologically relevant matters. And the view more and more gains ground that the *Massoretic text* upon the whole is the best form of the text, even if versions in many single cases may have a better reading<sup>2</sup>). *Veritas Hebraica* in the reliability of its tradition stands above all other witnesses. Of course its value is not the same in all its parts. The Torah is relatively well preserved, while books like Sam. or Hosea have been badly damaged by textual corruption. *Chron.* again has a better text than Sam; it has not been read so much and therefore the manuscripts have not been worn so much<sup>3</sup>). The handing down of the Law probably has been attended to with special care.

<sup>1</sup>) But in the case of *Chron.* we must remember that *Gerleman* proved that *Chron.* rest on a text of Kings different from MT (*Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament* (1948); cf. *Kahle*, *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle*, pp. 29,40).

<sup>2</sup>) This is not so recent an acknowledgement as it seems according to the description given by *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet*, I p. 31, comp. e.g. the well balanced words of a literary critic like *Steuernagel*, p. 83, cf. his very cautious words on the LXX, pp. 59ff., and the Peshitta, p. 68. Already 25 years ago a representative of the older critical school said to me that the more he worked the more confidence he got in the "Old Hebrew" text. A lamentable drawback in the stimulating works of *Engnell* is the lack of understanding of the continuity of scientific research. We all stand on the shoulders of others, and we owe infinitely much even to those with whom we disagree most heartily. It is a sign of real academic spirit to be able to admit this.

<sup>3</sup>) This assumption challenged by *A. Spiro*, Samaritans, Tobiads, and Judahites in Pseudo-Philo (1951), note 65, on remarkable grounds.

# THE FORMS OF LITERATURE

## ORAL TRADITION AND "LITERATURE"

In the opening chapter of this volume it was stated that in the last generation it has been proposed to transform the old-fashioned "Introduction to the OT" into a "History of OT Literature".

This claim had as its *primus motor* *Hermann Gunkel*, and it has been taken up, but in a manner which tried to preserve the advantages of the old form of the "Introduction", by *Eissfeldt* and *Weiser* who place some chapters on what is called the "pre-literary stage" of Israelitic-Jewish literature at the head of their Introductions<sup>1</sup>), and by the Swedish scholar *Gunnar Hylmö*, who more organically has worked the methods of *Gunkel* into his *Gamla testamentets litteraturhistoria* (1938). Only by a superficial judgment the short survey of *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet, en traditionshistorisk inledning I* (1945) can be said to represent a fresh start in the history of the Introductions. His treatment of Canon, Text and Forms of Literature present many views of personal originality, e.g. concerning the history of religion in Israel, to which he devotes a special chapter, and in his exclusive interests in oral tradition, taken over from *Nyberg*, and on special points, e.g. the problem of the Pentateuch. But concerning the forms of literature his book is only an abridgement of more voluminous works, e.g. that of *Hylmö*.

*Eissfeldt* and *Weiser* are right to the extent that the forms of literature were developed before the works reached their fixed written form, in the age of purely oral tradition. But the arrangement of the material by these scholars conceals the important fact that oral tradition has been of enduring importance also after the beginning of the "literary ages". The forms of literature are found not only in the "pre-literary" stage of history, but are of great importance also in "literary" times. We do not want to create prejudices by speaking of a "pre-literary" stage. We shall treat the literary questions of the forms of literature as part of the "General Introduction", which formerly only contained the history of the Canon and of the Text. This arrangement is justified by the plain fact

<sup>1</sup>) in *Rost's* ed. of *Sellin's* *Einleitung* this is now also the case.

that the General Introduction deals with the Old Testament as a whole, and the examination of the forms of literature also concerns the Bible as a whole, not the special books (cf. p. 18).

In this connection it is necessary to underline the *importance of oral tradition* in the literature of the Ancient Orient. This has been done especially by Swedish scholars, first by *H. S. Nyberg*<sup>1)</sup>, then by the Norwegian *H. Birkeland*<sup>2)</sup>, and by *Mowinkel*<sup>3)</sup>. The latter tries to combine the new points of view with the older ones of literary criticism, of which he is the unsurpassed master to-day. This compromise, to which the present writer is also inclined to subscribe, has met vigorous opposition from the younger members of the Swedish so-called "Uppsala school", especially *Engnell*<sup>4)</sup>, who repudiate the compromise and declare that the new school of "*history of tradition*" must deal with literature principally as oral tradition, and that the literary form in which the books now lie before us is so strongly determined by the forms and laws of oral tradition that it is necessary completely to leave the old methods of literary criticism behind as hopelessly out of date.

Before we give our reasons for our "reactionary" and "anachronistic" sticking to the compromise between the new views and the old-fashioned literary criticism we must stress our appreciation of the new views.

First, perhaps, we should note that these views are not so entirely new. *Robertson Smith*, in his famous book *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*<sup>5)</sup>, writes: "We in the West have little idea of the precision with which an Eastern pupil even now can take up and remember the minutest details of a lesson, reproducing them years afterwards in the exact words of his master". *Robertson Smith*, it is true, then goes on to stress the insecurity of oral tradition, which he perhaps somewhat exaggerates, but nevertheless his observations serve as a healthy admonition to people who are now giving too much attention to this form of tradition. Also *Gunkel*, in his famous *Introduction to his commentary on Genesis*, has paid much attention to the importance of oral tradition, especially in the transmission of the old legends. But *Nyberg* has drawn attention in an emphatic manner to oral tradition as the foundation in the transmission of poetry, law, and upon the whole of "literature" in the

<sup>1)</sup> Studien zum Hoseabuche (1935), pp. 7ff. *Irans forntida religioner* (1937), pp. 9-15. The German edition is not accessible to me.

<sup>2)</sup> Zum hebräischen Traditionswesen (1938), esp. pp. 6-14.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. especially the third volume of the great Norwegian translation of the OT: *Det gamle testamente oversatt av Michelet, Mowinkel og Messel* (I, 1929, II, 1935, III, 1944).

<sup>4)</sup> cf. above p. 102, cf. also his notes in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1945, in his article on the songs of the servant of Yahwe.

<sup>5)</sup> 2nd ed. 1892, p. 39f. Cf. also *Mowinkel*, *Prophecy and Tradition* (1946).



East. He says<sup>1)</sup>: "Tradition in the Orient is seldom purely literary; it is predominantly oral. Living speech from old time played and still plays a more important part than the written language. Nearly every writing down of a work in the Orient had — down to the most recent past — as its predecessor a longer or shorter period of oral tradition, and still after the writing down oral tradition continues to be the normal form of the continued existence and use of a work. This also applies to the Koran, which in a stricter sense than every other document of revelation is regarded as a book. No Mohammedan scholar ever looks a place up in his copy of the Koran. The book must be learned by heart, and it is used and quoted from memory. The Parsee-priest in Jezd whom my friend *H. W. Bailey* visited recited the Yasna, of which he did not understand one single syllable, fluently by heart from A to Z. A book he certainly possessed; but when *Bailey* asked for information concerning the pronunciation of some written word, he first had to take the trouble to spell the first word of the page, and having so found the trace he could recite until he encountered the word which had to be investigated. Of course I cannot here take up the question in its whole extent, but I note that the man who does not pay sufficient attention to the old strongly rooted habit of the Orientals, to prefer oral tradition to the written word, bars his own way to the understanding of every form of Oriental literature"<sup>2)</sup>.

The historical importance of this for the Old Testament is of course apparent. Only on this presupposition of the importance of oral transmission can it be understood that the literature of the Old Testament from pre-exilic days survived the crisis of the *Babylonian exile*. The priests, the disciples of prophets, and the sages can scarcely have been allowed to carry much more luggage with them in the long deportation columns of 587 than let us say Poles or Jews deported by the Nazis in our times, or Armenians in the Turkish transports 30 years ago<sup>3)</sup>. Manuscripts or clay tablets "incidentally" saved would certainly have had to be supplemented by living oral tradition. A later generation considered it a miracle that the Law could have been restored after the burning of the temple. The author of 4 Ezra believes that it was due to Divine Inspiration that *Ezra* was enabled to rewrite the Law (cf. p. 26). An illustration of the danger threatening the books is furnished by a discovery in stratum E

<sup>1)</sup> Studien zum Hoseabuche, p. 7f.

<sup>2)</sup> Other illustrations are given by *Birkeland*, loc. cit.

<sup>3)</sup> The comparison with the Turkish transports of Armenians was made by *Hempel*, *Die Althebr. Literatur*, p. 145. The more recent analogies alluded to above are more hideous, because it was the people that boasted of being the bulwark of Europe against Eastern barbarism that carried them out, cf. ZATW 1944, p. 152, n. 1.

in *Hama*, destroyed by *Sargon* in 720 B.C. Here *Ingholt* found cuneiform tablets containing astronomical, economical, magical, and ritual material lying scattered in or near the doors of a building. It looks as if somebody has tried to save the tablets during fire, but lost them in the hurry to get out<sup>1</sup>).

But, on the other hand, against the dogmatic assertions of the impossibility of a compromise between the older literary criticism and the approval of the importance of oral tradition a few observations must be made<sup>2</sup>).

First, we must draw attention to an argument, underlined by *Lindblom*<sup>3</sup>). Speaking of the question, has the author of the *Book of Job* known the supposed older story of *Job* in written or still in oral form, *Lindblom* says: "Cette question n'est pas importante, car une narration tout à fait stéréotypée dans la tradition orale ne diffère point, à l'égard de la forme, d'un document écrit". This principle must be kept in mind. The difference between a narrative, so fixed and firm in form as the old narratives must be supposed to have been, is in no way different from a written document. This is already strikingly illustrated even by the example given by *Nyberg* from the experience of Mr. *Bailey*.<sup>4</sup>)

But also other observations must be stressed. It must be regarded as important that certain circumstances give evidence to the fact that in Israel at least some special developments gave written tradition a greater weight. *Hölscher* has noted that the introductory vision of *Ezekiel* with the strange idea of the prophet being ordered to swallow a book in this particular is "characteristic of a literary age"<sup>5</sup>). It is certainly true that *Isaiah* did not write many words<sup>6</sup>), and that in heroic faith he limited himself to the principle of Is. 8,16, i.e. he used oral tradition of his words to be preserved by his disciples. But this refraining from writing is in the eyes of the prophet an act of faith which seems to presuppose that at his time a certain insecurity concerning the value of oral tradition had set in. — *Jeremiah* at a critical point in the history of his country makes *Baruch* take down his words in writing. This seems to prove the same thing. In face of imminent catastrophe the prophet thought it better to have his words preserved in written form — just as we have important

<sup>1</sup>) *Ingholt*, Rapport préliminaire sur sept campagnes de fouilles à Hama en Syrie (1940), p. 115, n. 4. <sup>2</sup>) *Engnell*, Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 1945, p. 37, n. 30. <sup>3</sup>) La composition du Livre de Job (1945), p. 34; *North*, in The OT and Modern Study (1951), pp. 78ff. <sup>4</sup>) *Widengren*, Literary and Psychol. Aspects of the Hebr. Prophets (1948), p. 68. <sup>5</sup>) *Hesekiel*, der Dichter und das Buch (1924), p. 15; *Bertholet's* commentary (1937), p. 11; *Widengren*, op. cit. p. 76. <sup>6</sup>) *Engnell*, Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 1945, p. 39; cf. *Widengren*, op. cit., pp. 69ff.



documents microphotographed during times of war. Even after the destruction of *Baruch's* scroll it is said that the prophet had it restored (Jer. 36). So important did the prophet consider the written form even after his experience of what might happen to the book. — The preservation of the Law Book found during the reign of *Josiah* in 622 (2 Ki. 22–23) is certainly another example of the same tendency to secure the traditions in times of unrest and persecution by having them collected in written form. — Outside Israel, the great work of *Assurbanipal*, founder of the library of *Nineveh*, is an evidence of the same tendency to preserve old literature<sup>1</sup>). The libraries found in other places from still older times<sup>2</sup>) prove that literary tradition was used in a manner which cannot justify the sole importance attached by the “*Uppsala school*” to oral transmission. And the beginnings of the founding of the Canon of Holy Scripture (cf. p. 23) must also have given written tradition more importance than is supposed by the Swedish scholars. The zeal of the *rabbis* to prove the authority of the text (cf. p. 51) and the scrupulous respect for every letter, appearing in the school of *Akiba* and the *massorettes*, give evidence to a scepticism concerning oral tradition which must be kept in mind, even if it does not accord well with the practice of learning the Koran by heart (cf. above)<sup>3</sup>). Oral and written tradition has been maintained side by side for centuries<sup>4</sup>), and it may be supposed that the same oral tradition which has been reduced to writing at a certain age can be written down again in a still later period, if it has undergone changes, e.g. for theological reasons.

Of special importance for a greater appreciation of the written word must have been the class of *scribes*, the *sofērîm*. From ancient times they have been the learned men of the East, and to them their cherished art of writing must have been the natural form of tradition<sup>5</sup>).

We therefore must not only think of OT tradition as *purely* oral. It is *principally* oral, and has been handed down in different *circles* of men, each of these circles cultivating their particular forms of “literature”.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Meissner*, Babylonian und Assyrien II, pp. 330–35.

<sup>2</sup>) e.g. in *Ugarit*, cf. *Virolleaud*, La Légende Phénicienne de Danel, pp. 78ff.; cf. also in the same series (Mission de Ras Shamra, dirigée par *Claude F. A. Schaeffer*): *Ugaritica*, index général, s. v. Bibliothèque de Ras Shamra. We also shall mention (below, p. 245) evidence of *early historiography* in pre-Israelite Canaan, in written form, in the story of *Wen-Amon*.

In an article in *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 1942 pp. 62ff. *Mowinckel* has collected all the evidence showing the use of writing as the medium of the message of the OT prophets.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Robertson Smith*, The OT in the Jewish Church, p. 63, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup>) This may account for the origin of the different “sources” of the historical books, cf. also *Mowinckel*, *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 1942, pp. 65ff.

<sup>5</sup>) *Mowinckel*, op. cit. p. 102, cf. *G. W. Anderson*, *Harvard Theol. Rev.* 1950, pp. 248f.



The religious poetry, *Psalms*, was cultivated in certain *priestly* circles, while other priestly circles were occupied with the tradition of *laws*. The societies of the *disciples of prophets* with their master are the home of prophetic literature. Some of them at least are connected with sanctuaries and the priesthoods, e.g. sages (scribes), priests, and prophets — these circles are mentioned in *Jer.* 18,18. Isaiah (cf. above p. 105) “binds up the testimony and seals up the law among his disciples” (8,16), i.e. he delivers his teaching to them that they may pass it on to later generations. It is, as said before, an act of faith of high rank: He is sure of the truth of a word, spoken by a later kindred spirit, the unknown prophet of Is. 40ff.: “The word of our God shall stand for ever”. Perhaps it is an evidence of the isolated life of *Jeremiah* that he is compelled to have his words committed to pen, ink and papyrus (*Jer.* 36): The outcast, the breeder of mischief, the traitor — so he was looked upon — has not had a regular crowd of disciples to whom he was able to transmit his words. *Baruch* and perhaps a few others have saved his poems. But later *Deuteronomistic* writers have collected and worked out his thoughts in the prose sermons found in his book, so similar to the sermons in Deuteronomy, but nevertheless sometimes so marked by his radicalism, e.g. in the speech on the temple in ch. 7, which breaks through the more temperate language of the Deuteronomists. — Num. 21,27 mentions the *mōšēlim*, “they that speak in proverbs”, better: “the bards”, perhaps” the singers of taunting songs<sup>1)</sup> — certainly also a circle of poets, but perhaps of a special kind: people who are able to speak “strong words”, incantations<sup>2)</sup>. — The *burial song* also had its professional singers, men and women, especially sent for on occasions of mourning (*Amos* 5,16; *Jer.* 9,16). And then we have the *story-tellers* who have played a great part in the tradition of the great narrative-collections of Israel<sup>3)</sup>.

These and other circles transmit the spiritual possessions of the community, and here also the *writing* of it begins. But the writing does not mean that oral tradition ceases. What *Birkeland*<sup>4)</sup> says of the transmission of the prophetic words can well be extended to most of OT literature: As it stands now, it comes from the Jewish congregation after the exile, and most of it did not get its present forms till the fourth century B.C. It is the last link in a long process, beginning in oral tradition, where fixed complexes are formed, to which tradition is bound, chains of legends, the strata of the Pentateuch and the like, minor collections of prophetic utterances, minor collections of psalms,

<sup>1)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 101.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 168 on the meaning of *māšāl*.

<sup>3)</sup> *Gunkel*, *Genesis*, 3rd ed. p. LXXXV.

<sup>4)</sup> p. 14f.

and which by and by coalesce and are edited in our present books. But these must always in principle be regarded as the *written fixation of oral tradition*. Therefore it is not "die unterliterarische Schicht" (*Eissfeldt*) which has used the oral form of transmission, but even the people whom we would call "literarisch".

In fact there seems to be a small amount of truth in the old Jewish theory of the two forms of tradition in which the revelation from Sinai is believed to have been transmitted, even if it is unhistorical in its actual form.<sup>1)</sup> According to Rabbinic teaching the Tora has at its side an oral tradition, called *Kabbala* (from *kabbal*, "to receive"), which is also of divine origin and therefore binding obligation to Israel. It has been received on Sinai by *Moses* and by him transmitted to later generations and at last codified in the *Mishna* and the *Talmud*. In fact it is impossible to understand how the late Jewish authors like *Flavius Josephus*, who pretend to reproduce the contents of the Bible (*Josephus* repeatedly asserts that his "Antiquities" are a translation, in which he "neither adds nor takes away"<sup>2)</sup>), are able to give a representation of the Biblical history so different from that of the text which we know as the "original text", without assuming that these authors are reproducing a tradition which by degrees had been remodelled<sup>3)</sup>. Therefore it may be maintained that when we are speaking of "forms of literature", it is a one-sided expression. It is difficult to find a term really covering the contents and describing things adequately. For practical reasons we prefer to preserve the old established expression, making the word "literature" comprehend also *oral tradition*. We may do this with a good conscience, remembering the principle of *Lindblom*, quoted p. 105.

*Literature* has been mentioned in the course of the discussion above. Fundamental are the works of *Gunkel* (cf. p. 14). Important are the more recent works on history of OT literature, e.g. those of *Hempel* (cf. p. 14) and *Hylmö* (cf. p. 102). *Eissfeldt*, § 2-19 enumerating works up to 1934. *Weiser* (cf. p. 103). An important older work is the Swedish *Världslitteraturens historia II, Den israelitiska litteraturen*, cf. also *Hempel*, in *Record and Revelation*, ed. by *Wheeler Robinson* (1938) pp. 28ff. *Engnell* (cf. p. 102). Much valuable material is supplied by *Johs. Pedersen*, *Den arabiske Bog* (1946).—*E. Nielsen*, *Mundtlig tradition I-IV* (*Dansk Teol. Tidsskr.* 1952); *Ringgren*, in *Studia Theologica III*, 1.

## HISTORY OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE: ITS GENERAL CHARACTER

Old Testament literature is not an expression of the principle of *l'art pour l'art*. It generally has a practical aim, is pronouncedly *art pour la vie*. It will always be our task to find the "place in life", the sphere in which the works of literature have been used.

To the "place in life" always belongs a certain style. Every situation claims its appropriate formal expression: hence the stereotyped character of the different creations of art, the many fixed formulas especially in religious poetry.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. RGG, 2nd ed., s. v. Tradition II, Jüdische Tradition.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 23, *Josephus*, Ant. I, 5, cf. 17 and many other passages.

<sup>3)</sup> Concerning a similar degeneration in the *Avesta* tradition, see *Nyberg*, *Irans forntida religioner*, p. 12.



And finally, the works of literature are determined by their *traditional material*. Poems as well as narratives are filled with ideas and thoughts not only characteristic of the soul of their poet, but coming to him through the *milieu* in which he lives. It is the whole *cultural background* of poems, tales, laws, words of wisdom, and oracles of prophets, which is described by the word "*material*", — the matter which is at the disposal of the human creators of literature when they are to serve the people with their work, including motifs of legend, mythology, history, religious experiences and much more. To all this the scientific interpreter must pay attention.

The first thing to be done when we are to interpret a work of OT literature is to determine its *extent*: The individual *independent unity*, and the *smallest unities* of which it has been composed, must be clearly set out from the surrounding context. It is our task to see if a piece forms a *complete whole*, able to stand by itself; we must see if its story has been told in full, its thought exhausted, so that no more is needed. Purely *formal criteria* can help us here. In poetry as well as in prose we often are able to observe an explicit "*skeleton*": Introduction, corpus, and conclusion<sup>1</sup>). — Secondly, we have to determine *the general character of the piece*: if it is poetry or prose, and the "*type*" or "*category*" of the whole work and its subdivisions<sup>2</sup>). It must be noted that the classification ought to be undertaken on purely *stylistic, formal* grounds. If the *contents* of the pieces of literature are taken as starting-point, e.g. by determining a type as "psalms of the king", "royal psalms"<sup>3</sup>), we very often run into confused classifications. — Gunkel has pointed out that very often e.g. the types of Psalms can be recognized by their first couple of words: The hymn by its exhortation to praise God, the psalm of lamentation by its call to God and its cry for help etc. Of course the *contents* practically never can be left out of regard, especially not in the more popular poetry<sup>4</sup>). *Tendency* and similar phenomena play a rôle for the distinction between different sorts of legends<sup>5</sup>). But it is not the ideological contents, but *material* and the *place in life*, the *functions* of the piece of literature in the life of the community, which supply the most effective criteria. The *material* of the piece often indicates where it

<sup>1</sup>) cf. e.g. below, p. 149 concerning the Psalms. In case of the stories my commentary on Daniel in the treatment of the legends gives examples which could be supplemented by analyses of other tales.

<sup>2</sup>) The terms "*type*", "*category*", "*genre*", or "*sort*", "*kind*", "*class*", we shall use promiscuously as varying but synonymous translations of Gunkel's "Gattung".

<sup>3</sup>) cf. p. 147.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. pp. 124ff.

<sup>5</sup>) It will be of some difficulty to get adequate renderings of the Danish word "sagn" as different from "legende", because the English "legend" covers two ideas, cf. p. 233, n. 4.



has its function, e.g. by alluding to *rites* accompanying it. This is often seen in the Psalms, but elsewhere, e.g. in the *stories*, there should be investigation in this respect. Among the stories many often betray themselves as local legends or ætiological legends by their distinct conclusion: "Therefore..." (cf. Gen. 31,48; 32,33).

As main categories are given *poetry* and *prose*. The principal type of *prose literature* is *narrative*, with its subdivisions: the *myth* and the primitive *fairy-tale*, the *legends*, the "*short story*" ("*Novelle*"), the *devotional legend*, the *history-narrative*, and *historiography*. To the *poetical categories* belong the *wisdom sentence* (proverb), the priestly and prophetic *oracle*, and the *lyric poem*, the latter giving expression to most differing sentiments. The *lyric poetry* comprises many types. Here, we shall see, it is difficult if not impossible to distinguish clearly between "*profane*" and "*religious*", as was done by Gunkel and some of his followers<sup>1)</sup>; we therefore restrict ourselves to the enumeration of types without this distinction, using here only examples given by Gunkel: *Burial song*, *love song*, *mocking song*, *drinking song*, *wedding song*, *victory song*, *hymn* (of praise), *psalms of lamentation*. To poetry belongs also the *oracle*, which prophetic speech has used not only in its particular form, mostly in the form of the "*message*" (Botenspruch), "So has Yahweh said.....". The prophets have also adopted and adapted other forms of poetry to be used as oracles: the *biographical story*, especially of visions, the *threatening speech*, the speech of *promise*, or of *blame* (German: Strafrede), of *admonition*, and a series of types borrowed from other spheres of life. The prophets have used nearly every known, holy or profane type in order to bring their message to the ears and eyes of the people. — An important field of *prose literature* are the *laws*, the stylistic forms of which also claim special attention. *Drama* is not found in OT literature, but the Book of *Job* has the form of a dialogue, without the special features of drama, the distinct action. The attempts to solve the riddle of the *Song of Solomon* on the assumption of dramatic form have hitherto met with no success. Even if it is thought that we have traces of a *cultic drama* in Israel, no really dramatic piece of literature has been preserved.

History of literature proceeds to examine these forms, tries to tell how their history develops, how they evolve<sup>2)</sup> from small units, influence one another and mix, are written and merged into greater collections; how they are originally part of the art of the people, but by degrees become the work of

<sup>1)</sup> Gunkel, *Reden und Aufsätze*, p. 31.

<sup>2)</sup> It is interesting to note that Engnell who proclaims his work to be "anti-evolutionistic", nevertheless takes over some of Gunkel's thoughts of a certain form of poetry evolving from an "Urzelle".

artists. But when we use words like "to write history" and "evolve", and talk of a primitive art of the people before the work of artists, we must take care not to say too much. A real "evolution" from "lower" to "higher" forms cannot be established and described. When Gunkel thinks himself able to write the *history of the forms of literature* it must be said of his work that he has not had so great a success in this respect as in his defining and describing work on the categories<sup>1</sup>). His criteria are too uncertain, and his work rests too much upon a dogmatic evolutionistic view: He is inclined to regard the shortest forms as the oldest, and to regard the mixtures of different forms (so-called "liturgies") as young. But not even this last criterion for late date is a safe one. The *long* Song of Deborah (Judg. 5) from ca. 1200 B.C. exhibits a mixture of different categories: hymn of praise + different sorts of war songs. The same is the case with David's elaborate burial song on Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. 1), where we find an element of incantation (cf. p. 136). Gunkel's whole "history" of the forms rest upon the presupposition of an evolutionistic scheme which is not justified by the facts. We therefore in our handling of the literature shall be very reserved against attempts and temptations to write history. We shall mainly limit ourselves to the registering and description of the categories.

In addition we have to stress the fact that we have mostly to do with the *outward form* of the pieces of literature. Introduction and history of literature do not engage themselves much with the contents and the thoughts of the literary monuments. This is traditionally left to other branches of knowledge: history, history of religion, and OT theology. That this sometimes makes the Introduction somewhat "desolate", cannot be prevented. It must modestly understand its position as a humble servant of the Word. But what makes up for this is that the following pages cannot be read without the text of the OT open, so that the references are continuously looked up. And so the literature itself will speak to the mind of the devoted student and give him both aesthetic and the unique ethico-religious visions which it is the perpetual task of the OT to pass over to mankind. No elaborate eloquence can really exhaust this, and it seems better to leave it to the texts themselves to make their impression on the individual student of the OT.

The history of OT literature is therefore most concerned with the *forms* of literature, and also not so much with the *men* who have been the human

<sup>1</sup> I have underlined this already in my Indledning til de gammeltestamentlige Salmer (1932), pp. 46ff. But I think – cf. the preceding note – that one ought not to be too dogmatically "anti-evolutionistic", cf. Gyllenberg in Finsk Teologisk Tidskrift 1946, p. 158. The "anti-evolutionistic" view is defended vigorously by Widengren, in Religionens ursprung (1946). – Mowinkel, in Offersang og Sangoffer (1951) several times underlines that the *pure types* are not necessarily early, but in many cases late.

agents in the process of its creation, at least not so much with *biographies* of the poets and the like. This is also a consequence of the given circumstances. In fact we do not know much of the life of the persons behind much OT literature. Concerning *prophets*, or e.g. the man who wrote the poem of *Job*, or the author of *Ecclesiastes* we certainly are able to tell a great deal as to their "personality" and the experiences behind their work. We can read a lot out of the thoughts expressed in their works. That will present itself, too, in the treatment of the individual books. But as their activity so greatly belongs to the history of culture and religion, such investigations must to a great extent be left to the other branches of our science, enumerated above.

But moreover, our knowledge concerning these subjects is scanty. We do not know anything of the oldest poets. OT literature is to a great extent *anonymous*, and the information from tradition concerning poets and authors is in the main late and not very reliable in many cases. That *David* was a poet is a tradition firmly established, just as *Moses* has been a law-giver, *Solomon* a poet and a wise teacher, and the *prophets* authors of oracles and history-books. But in all these areas tradition is not undisputed or indisputable. We have not one single poem which scholars unanimously will derive from the mouth of *David*. Not even the authenticity of the lamentation of *Saul* and *Jonathan* can boast of unanimous support. The traditions of *David's* authorship of some psalms cannot lead to more than a *non liquet*. Similar observations can be made on the relation of the historic *Solomon* to the books of wisdom and poetry traditionally ascribed to him. The tradition of *Moses* as author of the Law, of so great importance to the OT, is — to put it mildly — very uncertain. That *Moses* has been a law-giver should not be doubted, but it is impossible to trace one single element of the Law in its present form back to him. As transmitters of legal literature the literature itself refers to the *oracle-priests*, especial the Levitical priests (cf. p. 213f.), and to *kings* and *chiefs*.<sup>1)</sup> — Num. 21,27 mentions some anonymous "*bards*" (cf. p. 107). The book of *Lamentations* is ascribed to *Jeremiah*, but tradition is not more certain here than in other cases, with the exception of the lamentation on *Zedekiah*, not found in this book, but enclosed in one of the prophet's oracles (Jer. 38,22, cf. p. 136), and on *Jehoiachin*, of which the same is true. We are better off in the case of the *prophets* where a nucleus generally can be found, with some probability to be regarded as authentic.<sup>2)</sup> *Wisdom* literature too is in most cases anonymous. Even so

<sup>1)</sup> with certain limitations, cf. pp. 228ff.

<sup>2)</sup> The scepticism expressed by *Engnell*. Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 1945, p. 40, is — as his appended note shows — not to be taken too seriously, cf. *Mowinkel*, Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift 1938, p. 319.—cf. II, pp. 102f.



marked personalities as *Ecclesiastes* and the author of the Book of *Job* do not give their names. By name we only know one teacher of Wisdom, before the time of the rabbis, *Jesus Siracides*. Similarly the whole history-telling literature gives us no names of authors.

*Literature:* Gunkel, Reden und Aufsätze, pp. 29–38. Old Testament Essays. Papers read before the Society for Old Testament Study ... at Keble College, Oxford, Sept. 27th to 30th, 1927, pp. 118–142. – On the traces of *cultic drama*, cf. *Johs. Pedersen*, *Israel, its Life and Culture* III–IV, in the places named in the index s. v. "Drama". *Mowinkel*, art. "Drama" in RGG, 2nd ed. – *F. Hvidberg*, *Graad og Latter i det Gamle Testamente* (1938). – *Gaster*, *Thespis* (1950), with a series of preliminary studies, listed by *Kapelrud*, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts* (1952), p. 152.

## NATIVE AND FOREIGN MATERIAL IN OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE

The people of Israel lived in a country which was, to some extent, isolated from its surroundings. It is called a people that dwells alone and does not reckon itself among the nations (Num. 23,9). Nevertheless, it did not evade intimate relations with the world in which it lived. The Old Testament describes the conflict into which its religion was thrown through the contact with the *Canaanites*. And the more we get knowledge of the *Canaanite milieu* of Palestine through discoveries in Palestine proper and in the neighbouring countries the more clearly we see how much, and how much of *value*, Israel has received from both. It was not only sexual cult and astral religion and ethico-religious degeneration. It was an entire culture with its manifold material and spiritual *forms* which meant cultural progress to Israel, and also religious progress. With forms came *contents* not always to be rejected by the people of Revelation. Through Israel's reception and assimilation of these things the Heathen bring their gold and incense and myrrh to the child in Bethlehem. In its entire history the Israelite literature is widely to be understood as part of the World-literature of the Ancient East<sup>1</sup>).

This "universally human" feature of the OT must not be concealed or suppressed by an accentuation of the "gulf" between the OT and the Heathen religions. It is part of the living-circumstances of Revelation to which certain theologians seem blind. But rightly considered it contains an important religious idea, giving an accentuation of the universality of the Gospel which is not to be overlooked. The opposite view betrays a Pharisaic tendency, always inherent in orthodoxism and pietism.<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) *Hempel*, *Die althebr. Lit.*, p. 11.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. my *Indledning til de gammeltestamentlige Salmer*, p. 11f.; *E. Gulin*, *Gamla testamentets förblivande värde* (1932), p. 63; and now also *Engnell*, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1947, p. 139, n. 59. – cf. *Norsk Teol. Tidsskr.* 1951, pp. 219–223.

On account of what was said in the preceding paragraph, that the literarily fixed form of OT literature has not the decisive importance generally supposed, we shall not here treat the problems of *forms of script, material for writing* etc. This has been done above pp. 42ff. A presentation of *non-Biblical monuments of literature* as that given by Hempel, *Altheb. Lit.* pp. 11ff. we are under no obligation to give. The review of *inscriptions* is better given in *Histories of Israel* and of the spiritual culture of the people. In agreement with the traditional Introductions we limit ourselves to the literature found in the book to which we are writing Introduction, the OT with the addition of such books as have, for a shorter or longer period, belonged to it (the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha), or as are of importance for the history of the Book, e.g. the Letter of Aristeas (cf. *Albright*, in *The OT and Modern Study*, pp. 1-47; *Honeyman*, *ibid.*, pp. 264ff.).

From ca. 1600 B. C. Palestine was part of the *Egyptian Empire* of the so-called New Kingdom. But already before this date the cultural connections between Syria and Egypt have been firmly established. And even after the collapse of the Asiatic Empire of Egypt after the days of *Ramses III* (1198-67) the communications between the two areas were not cut off. Down to the *Assyrian*, and still at the beginning of the *Babylonian* period in pre-exilic times Palestine is Egyptian sphere of interest, and we are well informed concerning the relations between Israelite and Judaeen kings and their - at least nominal - liege lord in the Nile valley. Strategically, Palestine is the *glacis* of Egypt, and culturally it therefore belongs to Egyptian spheres. Poetic literature, psalms, and Wisdom books, exhibit many similarities to Egyptian literature. The near relations between the solar hymn of *Akhenaten* and Ps. 104 have often been taken as a symbol of these connections<sup>1</sup>). But other Egyptian hymns prove that dependence is rather a dependence of a poetical type than of this particular example. But even so the connections prove cultural connections of deeply rooted character. Similar observations can be made concerning the Wisdom books. Here the Wisdom of *Amenemope*, probably the source of Prov. 22, 17ff. (cf. II), is perhaps the most striking example of direct relations between Israel and Egypt. That the story of *Joseph* in one of its scenes uses a motive also known from an Egyptian narrative (of the unfaithful wife and the young man of unshakable purity) is universally acknowledged. All this is only single characteristic examples to illustrate the communications between the Nile valley and its Eastern *glacis*. Upon the whole, we find the same categories and the same formal character in both countries.

But the connections between Palestine and the countries to the *North* and *East* are also apparent.<sup>2</sup>) Palestine is not only a *glacis*, it is a *bridge* between East

<sup>1</sup>) cf. my commentary, p. 534; further material e. g. by *Blackman*, in *The Psalmists*, ed. by D. C. Simpson (1926), pp. 177ff.; *Mowinkel*, *Offersang og Sangoffer*, p. 451.

<sup>2</sup>) A good English survey can be obtained by means of *Barton*, *Archaeology and the Bible* (6th ed. 1933); cf. also *Finegan*, *Light from the Ancient Past* (1947). *Pritchard*, *Near Eastern Texts* (1950).

and West, even to-day. The powers contesting the influence of Egypt in Palestine and Syria, i.e. the changing kingdoms of *Asia Minor* and *Mesopotamia* (Hittites, Assyrians, Babylonians – to mention only the popularly well-known), and after the exile *Iran*, also have left the traces of their culture in Palestine, in law, religious and secular poetry, wisdom, style of inscriptions, myths and legends.

And finally, the *excavations* prove that already in early ages influences from the coasts and islands of the *Mediterranean* have been at work. Cultural influence from this corner of the world is not traceable till *Hellenistic* times, contemporary with the *Iranian* elements of culture. That does not mean, however, that it could not have been exerted, but only that we do not know its extent<sup>1</sup>).

Most of these influences do not come to Israel directly, but through the medium of the Canaanite culture, the *syncretism of Syria-Palestine*.

In recent years British scholars have particularly emphasized the *unity of the culture of the Ancient Near East*, especially in the sphere of the *cultus*. We speak of a "*cultic pattern*", common to the whole area, with the divine king as its central figure.<sup>2</sup>) These ideas have been taken up and developed by Swedish authors<sup>3</sup>). This tendency is to a large extent an attempt to realize the programme of *Gunkel*, who also saw it as the task of the history of literature to *place the Israelitic-Jewish literature on the background of the world-literature of the Near East*. He has opened up a very important line of study and has himself given numerous contributions to it through the voluminous material which he assembles in his works, to illustrate the Old Testament.

In taking up this work it is necessary to avoid letting it dominate the history of literature to such a degree that it becomes a history of the literature of the Ancient East. The Oriental parallels may be adduced as illustrations in the descriptions of OT types of literature and their history. It must be borne in mind that in the history of literature we are mostly concerned with a *comparison of forms*, not of contents. This must be left to other branches of learning such as the history and phenomenology of religion, and last but not least systematic theology. It must however be stressed that in these fields a great task lies before us,

<sup>1</sup>) *Hempel*, *Westliche Kultureinflüsse auf das älteste Palästina* (*Palästinajahrbuch* 1927, pp. 52ff.)

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Hooke's* symposia, *Myth and Ritual* (1933), and *The Labyrinth* (1935), and his *The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual* (*Schweich Lectures* 1938). Other important works are enumerated by *Engnell*, in his dissertation on *Divine Kingship*.

<sup>3</sup>) *Engnell*, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* (1943); *The text II K from Ras Shamra* (*Religion och Bibel*, *Nathan Söderblomsällskapets Årsskrift* 1944, pp. 1ff.). *Widengren*, *Det sakrale kungadömet bland öst- och västsemiter* (*ibid.*). Cf. also my book *Det sakrale kongedöme* (1945).



claiming a new treatment. *Widengren* in his book on the Psalms of Lamentation<sup>1)</sup> has emphatically pointed out that neither *Gunkel* nor his faithful disciple *Begrish* always do full justice to the religious life in Babylonia in their comparison with the Jewish. And modern systematic theology, in its energetic concentration on the Biblical revelation and its singular character often reaches its results concerning the non-Biblical religions too easily. But it is not the task of the writer on Old Testament forms of literature to enlarge upon these – in themselves important – questions.

Concerning the idea of the common Oriental *cultic pattern* perhaps a few words should be said. It is of course right that there is a large measure of unity in Oriental culture. Forms, phrases, and words in many cases are the same or of similar meaning. Seen from a distance the culture of the Ancient Orient is as much a unity as modern European culture.<sup>2)</sup> But like European the Ancient Oriental culture has also its individual differences, not only regarding religious and moral ideas, but also in formal respects. *Stummer*<sup>3)</sup> says that although the forms of religious poetry in Sumer and Accad and in Israel are the same on the whole, there nevertheless are *differences* not only of material, but also of form. In Israel the stylistic schemes are treated with greater freedom. In this *Stummer* sees an evidence of progress. But we may equally well assume that it is the result of degeneration parallel to the phenomena seen in Phoenician industry where e.g. Egyptian forms degenerate into shapes showing that they are no more understood. In poetry this degeneration of forms may have originated in Canaan before the forms were taken over by Israel. The idea of a common cultic pattern must accordingly be used with caution. The words may have another value in Palestine than in Egypt, Asia Minor, or Mesopotamia, and even among the Canaanites and Israelites. But it is not wrong to say that in principle and to a certain degree the culture of the Ancient Near East can be regarded as a unity, and that accordingly it is justified to seek information for the understanding of OT literature in similar products from other Oriental peoples. Religious feelings and experiences may, psychologically, be the same in different countries, just as the gods may be of the same types, even if they have different names. The truth of religion must be sought in its contents, not in its psychological, ritual or other forms, nor in its divine names. In the field of the history of literature parallels are of greater value than the parallels drawn in the field of the comparative history of religion, because the former mostly

<sup>1)</sup> The Accadian and Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation as Religious Documents (1936), cf. my commentary on the Psalms, p. IX.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. my Indledning til de gtl. Salmer, p. 13f.

<sup>3)</sup> Sumerisch-akkadische Parallelen zum Aufbau alttestamentlicher Psalmen (1922).

concern formal phenomena, not the life of the culture itself<sup>1</sup>). In the field of the history of literature, and of formal and stylistic criticism, such parallels can be used with much greater assurance, the material of the parallels being now so abundant, and because the culture is to a great extent a unity. The many *Canaanite* parallels from the *Ras Shamra* texts are of the greatest importance.

But on the other hand, if we ask whether it is our duty to study the particular rôle of Israel in the use of the international forms, the position is perhaps a little different. For here we shall unquestionably encounter the fact that the *contents*, i. e. the particular character of the religion of Israel, will assert itself. What separates the laws of Israel e. g. from the legal literature of the Orient as a whole, is no task of literary or formal, stylistic criticism. The decisive distinction always reveals itself in the contents of Israelite religion. But it may be noted that the religion of Israel has contributed largely to the development of the *forms of oracles* through the particular phenomenon, the *prophets of Israel*. Even if we are able to prove that formally prophecy has many analogies in the other Oriental nations<sup>2</sup>), the differences in the material sphere, the *contents* of the words, will give the Hebrew prophets a position apart. And also *formally* this will be of importance. Taken as a whole, the prophetic literature of the Old Testament of course contains much material, especially in the later products and in apocalyptic literature, which is not of much value from an aesthetical point of view, as "great poetry". But even in this later literature there are passages of great value, e. g. parts of 4 Ezra., the Greek *Baruch* ch. 6–8, and parts of the *Life of Adam and Eve*. But above all, the great prophets (*Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Jeremiah*, and some parts of *Ezekiel* and *Deutero-Isaiah*) exhibit a brilliance in the use of the forms, and not only of the particular oracular forms, which gives them a higher rank *as poets* than any corresponding phenomena in Babylonia or Egypt or elsewhere<sup>3</sup>). The prophecies of *Ipuwer* and similar works of Mesopotamia may formally be compared with the poetically feeble post-exilic utterances of *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, but not with poems of *Isaiah, Nahum* or *Jeremiah*. Among the international *Wisdom books* the *Book of Job* rises high above the parallel specimens in the kindred cultures and can stand beside the great works of the Athenian tragic poets wrestling

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Sven Herner*, *Gamla testamentets religion* (1927), p. 8.

<sup>2</sup>) *Haldar*, *Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites* (1945).

<sup>3</sup>) According to *E. Gulin*, *Gamla testamentets förblivande värde* (p. 142), the great Finnish Orientalist *Tallqvist* in 1924 in *Finska Orientaliska Sällskapet* said that the literary products of Babylonians and Assyrians cannot be compared with the corresponding parts of the OT without showing the greater value of the latter. – Examples are found in AOT, pp. 46–55 and 281–84, and in *Barton*, op. cit. pp. 521ff.

with the same problem<sup>1</sup>). And even if we can find beautiful *tales* among other peoples, surrounding Israel, the *story of the succession after David* (2 Sam. 13–1 Ki. 1) is in quite another class than the Mesopotamian annals and the self-laudation of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings, which is – in the drastic terms of *Mowinckel*<sup>2</sup>) – “more bellowing than art”. For so he characterizes the difference between the royal inscriptions from Mesopotamia and the book of *Nehemiah*, showing how the religion of Judaism has subdued the common Oriental noisy self-praise and so ennobled the *style of inscriptions*. The author of the history of the succession after *David* not only rises above the annals of his sphere of culture, but he is ca. half a millennium older than *Herodotus* and the other great Greek historians. With greater right he can claim the title “the father of history”. Of the same aesthetic value as narratives are e.g. the stories of *Elijah* or of the revolution of *Jehu*.

*Literature:* My *Israel's Historie*, pp. 66–87, with references in the notes. Our knowledge of the Syrian-Palestinian cultural *syncretism* has been greatly widened by the epoch-making discoveries at *Ras Shamra*. Literature up to 1939 is registered in the vol. III of the reports: *Mission de Ras Shamra, Ugaritica*, I série, par Cl. F.–A. Schaeffer (1939); cf. *Baumgartner*, *Theol. Rundschau* 1940–41. *De Langhe*, *Les Textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et leurs Rapports avec le Milieu Biblique de l'Ancien Testament I–II* (1945). A good survey of Babylonian influence in *Ludin Jansen*, *Die Henochsgestalt* (1940), pp. 19ff.

S. *Nyström*, *Beduinentum und Jahwismus* (1946).

*Mowinckel*, *Offersang og Sangoffer* (1951), ch. XXI.–*Albright* (see above, p. 114f.)–*Johs. Pedersen*, in *Studies in OT Prophecy* presented to T. H. Robinson (1950), pp. 127ff.; *Porteous*, *The Basis of the Ethical Teaching of the Prophets* (ibid., pp. 143ff.)–*G. W. Anderson*, in *The OT and Modern Study*, pp. 283ff.–*Lindblom*, in the *Bertholet-Festschrift* (1950), pp. 327–332. *G. Ernest Wright*, *The OT against its Environment* (1950).

This list could easily be expanded over pages, and I must apologize for its arbitrariness. The selection will however, I hope, serve as a starting point for those who want to study the subject more intensely. In addition to the works listed here and in the notes I must, last but not least, remind readers of the works of *Albright*, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (1946); *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1946; Swiss edition: 1949).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Lindblom*, *Boken om Job och hans lidande* (1940).

<sup>2</sup>) *Statholderen Nehemia* (1916), p. 159.



# POETRY

## THE FORMS OF HEBREW POETRY

Among the most particular characteristic elements of Hebrew poetry the so-called *parallelismus membrorum* is usually mentioned first. This phenomenon is however found in most Oriental poetry, in Egypt, Babylonia, and e.g. also in the Ras Shamra texts<sup>1)</sup>. It was first examined and described by the British scholar bishop *Lowth* in his important work *De sacra poësi Hebraeorum* (1753). But it seems that already *Ibn Ezra* had noticed it, for in his commentary on Is. 17,11 he points to the value of parallelism as a help for the interpretation<sup>2)</sup>. Also other Jewish scholars seem to have made use of it<sup>3)</sup>.

The Swedish orientalist *Esaias Tegnér* jun. has described parallelism as a "rhyme of thought"<sup>4)</sup>. It is best explained by saying that two corresponding parts of the verse are parallel expressions of the same thought, the two sections of the verse varying the same idea. *Lowth* established three categories of parallelism: 1) *Synonymous* or better *identical* parallelism, 2) *antithetic* parallelism, and 3) *synthetic* parallelism. The first form means that the same thought is expressed in both sections, only by different words. The second type in the second half of the verse brings an antithesis of the first and in this way throws light on the first clause. The third type is described as having such a form that the second part of the verse carries the thought of the first part further on. But it is obvious from this description that this is no real parallelism, unless we accept the sophistical explanation that a straight line is parallel to itself. *Hylmō* justly points out that this implies so many combinations and variations that it is more appropriate to speak of the *disintegration* of parallelism than of *synthetic* parallelism. He thinks<sup>5)</sup> that at most we may talk of numerical parallelism, for ultimately

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Erman*, *Die Literatur der Ägypter* (1923), p. 11f. *Max Pieper*, *Die ägyptische Literatur* (1928), p. 21; *Meissner*, *Die babylonisch-assyrische Literatur* (1928), p. 25; *Gordon*, *Ugaritic Grammar* (1940), pp. 78; *Ugaritic Handbook* (1946); *Ugaritic Literature* (1949).

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Buhl*, *Jesaja* (1912), p. XXXIII.

<sup>3)</sup> For other Jewish evidence cf. *G. B. Gray*, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry* (1915), p. 17f.

<sup>4)</sup> *Den nya öfversättningen af Psaltaren* (1888), p. 1f., cf. the "Ordförklaringer" attached to the Swedish Authorized Version of the Bible of 1917, s. v. "Poesi".

<sup>5)</sup> *Gamla testamentets litteraturhistoria*, p. 7.

everything in this case issues in a calculation of the relative length of the two parts of the verse.

While e.g. *Eissfeldt* still maintains<sup>1)</sup> that parallelism is a phenomenon not occurring in prose and therefore must be regarded as a characteristic of poetry, other authors refuse to accept this.<sup>2)</sup> They are inclined to say that parallelism is found in texts which are not poetry in the proper sense of the word. *Hölscher* e.g. says that the inauguration sermons of the first caliphs use parallelism, which therefore must be described as a *rhetorical*, but not exclusively poetical stylistic element.<sup>3)</sup>

A very difficult problem is presented to us by the question of *Hebrew Metrics*. What makes this especially crucial is our ignorance of the correct *pronunciation* of Hebrew at the time when it was a living language<sup>4)</sup>. From ancient writers we have no relevant information concerning the *rhythm* of Hebrew poetry. Some utterances in the *Antiquities of Josephus* (II, 346; IV, 303), that Ex. 15 and Deut. 32 were written by Moses in *hexameters* and that David composed songs and psalms in *hexameters* and *pentameters* (VII, 305), are of no help, for till this day it has been impossible to establish a scansion of these poems on the lines laid down by the Jewish Quisling. The same is true of some similar passages found in the works of *Philo* (*De vita Mosis* I, 5 (§ 23), *Origen*, *Eusebius*, and *Jerome*)<sup>5)</sup>.

During the last half century, especially, modern scholarship has worked eagerly to solve the riddles, and some systems have been constructed, apparently of some use. The most influential are those of *Bickell*, which has been further developed by *Hölscher*, and of *E. Sievers*, perhaps the most widely accepted, which was developed from the work of *Ley* and *Budde*. The *Bickell-Hölscher* theory assumes "feet" of two syllables of *trochaic* and *iambic* type, that of *Sievers anapaestic* "feet". It must however be noted that the use of the expressions borrowed from Greek and Latin poetry is inadequate, the "feet" of these systems not counting short and long syllables as the classic metres, but stressed and unstressed syllables. The theory of *Hölscher* is supported by *Mowinckel*.

The most important works are: *Ley*, *Grundzüge des Rhythmus, des Vers- und Strophenbaus in der hebräischen Poesie* (1875); *Leitfaden der Metrik der hebr. Poesie* (1887). *Bickell*, *Carmina Veteris Testamenti metrica* (1882); *Dichtungen der Hebräer zum ersten Male nach den Versmassen des Urtextes übersetzt I-III* (1882-83). *Budde*, *Das hebr. Klagelied* (ZATW 1882, pp. 1ff.; 1882, 1891, 1892, and ZDPV 1883). *Sievers*, *Metrische Studien I* (1901), II

<sup>1)</sup> p. 62.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Sievers*, *Metrische Studien I*, I, § 52; *Hölscher*, *Beih. ZATW*, 1920, p. 93; *Hylmö*, p. 7f.

<sup>3)</sup> *Hölscher*, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1938, p. 116f., cf. *G. B. Gray*, op. cit. pp. 40ff.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Kahle's Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 47-54 and 78-108, and 108-110.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. *Gray*, op. cit., pp. 10-17.

(1904-5), III, (1907). *Hölscher*, Beih. ZATW 1920, pp. 93ff. Cf. also *Rothstein*, Grundzüge des hebr. Rhythmus und seiner Formenbildung (1909) and the fine work of G. B. Gray, The Forms of Hebrew Poetry (1915). For reaction against too easy going optimism in matters of metrics, cf. H. S. Nyberg, Studien zum Hoseabuche, pp. 19ff. *Gordon*, loc. cit.; *Halдар*, Studies in the Book of Nahum (1947), pp. 10ff.

Concerning older theories, cf. my paper: Niels Pedersen's hebraiske metrik, et 300 Aars jubilæum (Teologisk Tidsskrift 1933, pp. 81ff). *Eissfeldt*, pp. 64ff.

Review of modern Literature in Theologische Rundschau 1932, p. 67ff., by *Begrich*. *Cobb*, A criticism of Hebrew Systems of Metre (1905).

*Hölscher*, Syrische Verskunst (1932).—*Mowinkel*, Offersang og Sangoffer (1951), ch. XX.

Three rhythmical systems are used in the literatures of the world: 1) the system of *counting syllables* used in Syriac and late Hebrew<sup>1</sup>), 2) the *quantitative*, working with alternating short and long syllables, best known from Greek and Latin verse, and 3) the *accentuating* system, in which stressed and unstressed syllables alternate, used in modern European poetry. According to the dominant theory of *Sievers* Hebrew poetry belongs to this third class. Hebrew rhythm is further mostly described as "ascending". Particles and other small words are considered able to stand in a certain *proclitic* relation to the chief word, while some *enclitic* words at times draw the accent away from the chief word. The *status constructus* is treated somewhat differently, and the question whether it should have one or two accents is probably often determined by considerations of euphony<sup>2</sup>).

The smallest rhythmical unit is the *foot* consisting of the stressed syllable and the preceding unstressed syllable(s) (*ictus* with preceding descension as in *deḇārīm*). The crucial question of Hebrew metrics is the problem of the *number of permissible unstressed syllables*. This difficulty is the more intricate on account of our — mildly speaking — scanty knowledge of the original pronunciation of the Hebrew language.<sup>3</sup>) *Hylmö* to whom we refer<sup>4</sup>) thinks that generally not more than three unstressed syllables in one foot are allowed. The system of *Hölscher*, not being accentuating, but rather more of the syllable-counting type, only finds two icts in each foot, and sometimes he assumes *syncopation*: The first short syllable is included in the preceding stressed syllable, well illustrated<sup>5</sup>) by his scansion of Job 3,3: *jōbād jōm / 'iwwāled bō*, where the unstressed syllable missing before *jōm* is found in the preceding *-bād*, perhaps read as *bā-ad*<sup>6</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) On the later, mediaeval poetry of the Jews important material is published in *Kahle's* Schweich Lectures 1941, pp. 20-33. <sup>2</sup>) cf. especially *Nyberg*, op. cit., p. 19f.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. above p. 120, n. 4. <sup>4</sup>) pp. 8ff.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 65.—More illustrations in *Mowinkel's* book, cf. the Bertholet-Festschr., pp. 379ff.

<sup>6</sup>) cf. *Hölscher's* scansion of the workers' song in Neh. 4,4, where he speaks of "fakultativer Synkopierung der Senkungssilben" (in *Kautzsch's* translation of the OT, 4th ed. II, p. 532).



A series of feet form a *stichos*, and two *stichoi*, less frequently three, form a *period*. The *stichoi* forming a period may be of *equal* length, having the same number of feet. They then are called *symmetrical* periods. If one of them, usually, but not always, the last, is shorter than the other, by a foot, the period is called *unsymmetrical*.

*Symmetrical* periods are either of the form 2+2, 3+3, or 4+4. The *unsymmetrical* periods are according to the number of ictus labelled as 3+2, 4+2, or 4+3. The arrangement 3+2 is often, erroneously, called *kīnā-rhythm*, because *Budde* thought it characteristic of the funeral dirges. In some cases it is the first *stichos* of the unsymmetrical period which is the shorter of the two. Such periods then are called "inversed" distichs. The *Hölscher*-System of course counts differently: The *kīnā* gets e.g. 4+3.

It is widely assumed that a poem may exhibit *alternating* rhythm ("Mischmetra" in German, variable metres). It is doubtful if regular *strophes* have been developed by joining a series of periods together according to a formal scheme. Such strophes have been assumed in *alphabetical* poems, at any rate in such poems where several lines are joined to one another, all of them beginning with the same letter of the alphabet (Ps. 119; Lam. 1-4)<sup>1</sup>. Poems with a refrain repeated at regular intervals are the most definite evidence of the formation of strophes (Ps. 42-43 and 46, or the endings of Is. 5 and 9).

A formal phenomenon to which attention has been drawn by *T. H. Robinson* is the so-called *anacrusis*<sup>2</sup>) which signifies that a word or small clause at the beginning of a period, an interjection, an appeal, a "therefore" or the like may stand outside the rhythmical scheme of the period in question.

Concerning the simplification of the system of *Sievers* advocated by the Swedish scholar *Arvid Bruno* (*Der Rhythmus der alttestamentlichen Dichtung* (1930); *Das hebräische Epos* (1935)), see *Lindblom*, in *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift* 1931, pp. 256ff.; *Eissfeldt*, *Orient. Literaturzeitung* 1936, col. 231. On *E. Lund*'s theory, *Acta Orientalia* 1939, pp. 249ff, see *Hempel*, *ZATW* 1939, p. 277. *Pfeiffer*, Introduction, pp. 271f. seems to use a system like that of *Hölscher*.—See also *Albright*'s contributions to the *Bertholet*-Festschrift, *The Studies* presented to *T. H. Robinson*, and to the Hebrew Union Coll. Anniversary Publications; and *Gordon*'s treatment of the metrical problems in his *Ugaritic Handbook*.

## PROFANE AND RELIGIOUS POETRY

The usual distinction between *profane* and *religious lyrics* is very difficult to maintain in OT literature. The nations of Antiquity were very keen on the distinction between "clean and unclean" (e.g. Ez. 44,23, and many other passages). But even the fact that it was the task of a particular class of men, the

<sup>1</sup>) A still more developed poem of the same kind as Ps. 119 from the Middle Ages is described by *Kahle* in his *Schweich Lectures* 1941, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup>) *Beih. ZATW* 1936, pp. 37ff.; cf. *ZATW* 1936, pp. 28ff. *Lindblom*, *Die Jesaja-Apokalypse* (1938), pp. 8ff.; *La composition du livre de Job* (1945), p. 43f.

priests, to teach the common people this distinction, proves that it involved intricate problems for the old world too. For us another difficulty is that we are inclined to regard many things as "profane" which in ancient times were soaked with religion, the whole of life being lived under religious aspects in a way and to a degree quite different from our secularized Western culture. Very often the distinction between secular, profane, and sacred, religious, poetry, is carried through too mechanically. An example is the view of *Gunkel*, expressed in his article "Dichtung, profane, im AT", in the first edition of the RGG, which is generally accepted in modern works.

On the other hand, theologians, and also modern historians of religions, are often too rash to assume the religious character of an object. We find a potsherd with the picture of a bird, and somebody exclaims "a Soul!". We find some carved rock in Syria or Palestine, and exclaim, "An Altar!" But more cautious archaeologists correct: "An olive press!" How many things in Petra did not *Dalman* interpret as cultic – but *Bachmann*, *Watzinger* and *Wiegand* proved that they were building-foundations!<sup>1)</sup> This, in connection with what was said above concerning the ancient interest in the distinction between sacred and profane, unclean and clean, should warn us against a hardy denial of the existence of "profane Dichtung" in the OT.

But under the pressure of the difficulties it nevertheless seems better to give up this distinction so far, that we do not arrange the forms of literature under the two fixed headings, profane and religious<sup>2)</sup>, but simply enumerate and describe the different categories of poetry on purely formal grounds and only raise the question, sacred or profane, in each individual case. But it should not be denied *a priori* that there may exist "profane" literature in the OT. It must be admitted that the boundary is so indefinite and elusive, and a category which originally has been "religious" or "cultic" may in later times appear in a secularized context of time. At least it is wrong to give the impression, that nearly all poetry – and literature upon the whole – is "religious". The OT describes Israel's life both on week-days and holy days.

The cause of the difficulties may, however, also arise from the fact that material for studying "profane" types is very scanty. Especially difficult is it very often to classify the older poetry according to the categories described by *Gunkel*. It is difficult to find real formal characteristics to give a clear picture of a distinct type or category. The older poems of which we have very few certain

<sup>1)</sup> Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen des deutsch-türkischen Denkmalschutzkommandos, Heft 3, Petra (1921, p. 27, n. 64). We can also refer to the discussions concerning the famous incense altar, or warming-stove, from Megiddo!

<sup>2)</sup> Cf. *Engnell*, Gamla testamentet I, p. 48.

specimens, very often seem so formless that a sure stylistic examination becomes very vague. Often they seem to have a purely interjectional character, to be merely immediate expressions of sentiment, not yet formed and framed as in unquestionably religious poetry, so distinctly marked by traditional patterns and forms. In these oldest poems therefore the *contents* play a greater part in determining the category than the formal criteria (cf. p. 126). This is a necessary inconsistency.

Not even the *expressions* used to signify the different sorts of literature are clear. Hence we cannot with certainty establish a *terminology* of the ancient Hebrews.<sup>1)</sup> The most common signification for "song" is *šir* or *širā*; but this word also seems to have another meaning, something like the German "Spruch", corresponding to Hebrew *māšāl*<sup>2)</sup>: As such it is a word of *power*<sup>3)</sup>. "The word of the poet creates what it names"<sup>4)</sup>.

The song was accompanied by *music* (Gen. 31,27; Amos 6,5; Is. 23,16; 30,29), and it could also itself accompany the *dance* (1 Sam. 18,6; Ps. 87,7; Ex. 15,20; Cant. 7,1).

But the material for determining really "profane" forms is as we have said very scanty. We are warned to use the greatest caution in pronouncing general rules on such a narrow basis<sup>5)</sup>. Comparison with parallel poetry from the Orient, both ancient and modern, furnishes us with helpful illustrations. Further, *Hempel* points out that the material would be much more scanty if the books of the *prophets* did not contain relatively many imitations of "profane" poetry.

### *Workers' songs.*

Apparently a quite clear, profane sentiment expresses itself in the *complaint of carriers* or perhaps "*strike song*", discovered by *Hölscher* in Neh. 4,4<sup>6)</sup>. By its tired heaviness it reminds us very much of a corresponding Egyptian song,

<sup>1)</sup> Cf. concerning religious poetry my *Forelæsninger over Indledning til de gammeltestamentlige Salmer* (1932), pp. 65ff.

<sup>2)</sup> Judg. 5,12, cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 94.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. p. 168.

<sup>4)</sup> *Magnus Stevns*, *Grundtvig Manuskripter* (1938), p. 16.

<sup>5)</sup> *Engnell's* words, *Gamla testamentet* I, p. 47f., are too sweeping; cf. p. 63, where he recognizes a profane origin of a popular proverb. Likewise, concerning his note p. 47, cf. below p. 144, n. 2.

<sup>6)</sup> Cf. his commentary in *Kautzsch*, 4th ed. The remarks of *Engnell*, op. cit. p. 48, against this determination seem too vague to be relevant. At least, in the case of Neh. 4,4 he has given no arguments for his verdict.



quoted by *Hylmö*<sup>1)</sup> as an illustrating parallel. It is very tempting to assume that such songs of workmen, of carriers and threshers, are purely "profane". But who can guarantee that there is not in these groans something of that which the Letter of James calls "the cries of the reapers" which are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth (5,4): A sigh under heavy burdens, even if formally it is purely profane, may well be a sigh unto God. Neh. 4,4 may well be an expression of the same thought as Zech. 4,6b and Ps. 127,1-2.

This problematic character of the working songs is more clearly seen in a specimen generally classified among profane literature, the so-called "Song of the Well" (Num. 21,17-18). It is very doubtful if this poem is "purely profane". The "staves" of the "princes", by means of which the well is dug, are the powerful sceptres of the chiefs<sup>2)</sup>, like the rod of Moses filled with divine power<sup>3)</sup>. The poem seems to allude to a well hallowed by legends like those of Ex. 17,6, Num. 20,11. But it has been re-interpreted by the redactor who brought it into the present context. And further we have to ask, Is a thing so important for the life of the desert-dwellers and their neighbours in the borderlands of the desert as the work of digging wells not something where religion has to come in?<sup>4)</sup> This carries us immediately to the other difficulty, the determination of the poem as a "workers' song". For has this poem not something *conjuring* about itself, is it not an *incantation*? In an authoritative imperative the well is *commanded* to overflow with water, and this imperative form we shall meet again in other incantations. The man speaking is the *man filled with power*, the man of God. But God is not mentioned; he seems to be out of view. There is something "magical" about the poem.

A Song of Work it may however be. It may be a sort of incantation to make the work have success. Songs of workmen *may* have a profane tone in our ears, and nevertheless be expressions of prayer. But when the sage in Sir. 38,25 haughtily asks, how can he be "educated" "who leadeth the cattle and turneth them about with song", he seems to exhibit some of the modern considerations. Even if the text does not speak of the song of the drovers<sup>5)</sup> the words nevertheless breathe a spirit of contempt which judges the ox-drover as "not educated" and *not pious* according to the conception of the proud Jewish acade-

<sup>1)</sup> p. 21; other Egyptian workers' songs in *Erman*, *Literatur der Ägypter* (1923), pp. 176 and 314.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Mowinckel's* Norwegian commentary in *Det gamle testamente oversatt ... I*.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. my commentary on Ps. 45, p. 251.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *G. A. Smith*, *The Early Poetry of Israel* (1912), p. 63f.

<sup>5)</sup> So the *Hebrew* text; the Greek translation has "whose *discourse* is with bullocks" (cf. *Charles's* edition, transl. by Box and Oesterley).

mician<sup>1)</sup>. And so far he is right, the cries of the drivers of beasts of burden are generally not "religious" in other senses of the word save that they *curse* the lazy oxen and asses every now and then. But we moderns must again be cautious. For what is a curse? A powerful word which aims at creating something – in this case to speed up the beasts! – The cries of harvest-people and of people trampling the grapes in the wine-press (*hēdād* is perhaps the technical term of these songs, Is. 16,9–10; Jer. 25,30; 48,33; 51,14) in many cases only seem to be a means of marking the rhythm of the work<sup>2)</sup>. But again, is this not a sort of incantation? We know that in connexion with harvest religious festivals were celebrated, the songs of which allude to the jubilations during harvest. Even if Ps. 65 is no thanksgiving for the harvest, verse 14 is a proof of this fact. And the religious rejoicing at vintage and wine-press is mentioned in Judg. 9,27, cf. Is. 16,10, 9,2 – not to mention the orgiastic expressions from the Ras Shamra texts.

The result of all this must be that "working songs" is a doubtful category, or rather, that it must necessarily have had sub-categories. And these sub-categories again are not special expressions for the social context, the work. Incantations are also used in other connections. So we see how difficult it is to work consistently on the lines of Gunkel's "Gattungsforschung". The fault seems to be that "working songs" is *no purely formal category* of literature. It would be more appropriate to make e.g. the *incantation* the chief category, and speak of incantations for work, and for other occasions which we shall find below also to make use of this "strong word". We should probably then be led back to the forms of *blessings and curses*. We shall see the same criticism against the usual determination of categories also in the following paragraphs. The whole field of categories needs a revision. But this demands a monograph. The aim of a handbook like the present work must be to point out such tasks for special investigation.

### *Mocking songs, drinking songs, watchman's song.*

The concluding remarks of the preceding paragraph will also find their confirmation here.

The prophetic books supply us with specimens of another type, in the usual terminology called *mocking songs*. Hempel points to the song jeering at Babel (Is. 47) or the similar one directed against Asshur (Is. 37,22, cf. also Hab. 2,6–19).

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 170.

<sup>2)</sup> *Hylmö*, p. 20; *Dalman*, *Arbeit und Sitte* IV (1935), p. 365, cf. also *Hinrich Johansen*, *Die paläst.-arab. Dichtkunst ... in Festgabe für Ad. Schlatter*, pp. 60ff.



From earlier ages we have Num. 21,27-30, scoffing at Moab. All this is *political* mocking poetry, and some of it perhaps belongs to *war lyrics* (cf. below). Again, the *profane* character is doubtful. For again we must realize that a mocking song is a sort of *curse*, *incantation*, *imprecation*. The prophets use this form to create misfortune for the enemy. In some places mocking songs are called *māšāl*, signifying the powerful, creative word<sup>1</sup>).

On the other hand, the quotation of a *harlot's song* in Is. 23,16 seems to point to a quite profane song, perhaps taken from actual songs sung by harlots<sup>2</sup>). But the quotation itself shows that we have not a harlot's song in the proper sense, but a song mocking at an old harlot who is called upon eagerly to attract the attention of men. The context seems to imply that her exertions shall be crowned by success. If this was the meaning in the poem from which the quotation was taken, we do not know. It would probably not be the meaning of a song mocking the old lady whose faded graces do not attract men any more. The *imperative form* of the poem again points to some sort of *curse*. The idea of blessing seems to be excluded!

The usual enumeration of "profane" categories goes on to mention "*drinking songs*". A quotation seems to be found in Is. 22,13. Its theme, "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die", is also known from Hellenistic times, gruesomely represented on the bowl from *Boscovale*, where a row of skeletons symbolically conjures up the feeling of the uncertainty of wisdom, underlined by the inscription, "Enjoy life, while you are living, for the to-morrow is uncertain!", cf. the application in 1 Cor. 15,32. Another fragment of a drinking song we have Is. 56,12. Here the sentiment is different; men live on without thinking that the morrow is uncertain. A third reminiscence is probably found in Eccl. 10,19<sup>3</sup>), and a fourth in Cant. 5,1. From a later time we have an example in Wisd. 2,1-9. Drinking songs are alluded to in Amos 6,4-6 and Is. 5, 11-13<sup>4</sup>). Here as in Sir. 32,4 we perhaps have illustrations of the custom to have musical entertainment at banquets.

The drinking songs are the poems where a "religious" sentiment is most difficult to discover. The prophets use their quotations to describe the irreligious mood of those cursed in their speeches. *Akiba* in a famous word

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Boström*, *Paronomasi i den äldre hebreiska maschallitteraturen* (1928), p. 22. *Eissfeldt*, pp. 72 and 99.

<sup>2</sup>) "ein Beispiel vulgärer Muse" (*Procksch*), cf. *Horace*, Ep. 1,14, 25f., mentioning Oriental, singing and playing harlots in Rome. That the song in the context of a prophetic book is religious (*Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet*, p. 48) is a truism. The connection with "religion" must be established upon the form of the preserved fragment.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Galling*, in *Handbuch z. AT*, ed. by *Eissfeldt*; my commentary, ad. loc.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. *Hempel*, p. 25. *Eissfeldt*, p. 97.



(*Tosefta Sanhedrin* XII) has attested the profane use of songs like the poems of Cant. in the taverns<sup>1</sup>). And this at least proves that "profane" songs have existed and been used at drinking parties. Of course this also has consequences e.g. for the harlot's song<sup>2</sup>).

An allusion to the *song of a night-watchman* is presupposed in Is. 21,11-12: A question to the watchman, What o' clock is it? seems to be answered in a sulkily ironical tone by the watchman<sup>3</sup>). That watchmen were used by night in the towns we know from evidence, especially Cant. 3,3; 5,7. Here again it seems most appropriate to speak of "profane" poetry. At any rate the words in Is. 21 have no religious content. If night watches in Palestine have chanted religious songs on their rounds in the city, like the custom in Mediaeval Europe, we do not know.

### *Wedding poetry.*

This expression we take in a rather wide sense, much of the poetry summed up under this heading being probably more general love lyrics.

The love songs of "Solomon's Song" at first glance seem to be "purely profane" poetry. The *allegorical* interpretation which in Protestant theology of the 19th century had a late, modified representative in *Delitzsch's typological* use of the theory which found a *drama* in this little book (cf. in our times *Kuhn* and *Waterman*) has been almost completely abandoned. The usual interpretation today is that the book contains *popular love-poetry*, and the "place in life" of the songs is supposed to be the *wedding festival*.

We know that the wedding in Israel as in the modern Orient was a time of feasting. It lasted a *week* (Gen. 29,27-28). *Jeremiah* uses the disappearance of the wedding songs among his impressive descriptions of the devastation of the country. To day too the jubilant shrill cries of the dancing women and the rhythmical monotony of the drums are also characteristic sounds of the Oriental landscape in the time after harvest, when wedding festivals are going on, just as the sound of the mill in *Jeremiah's* days (Jer. 16,9; 25,10) and the pounding-sound of the coffee-mortar in our times. That the wedding festivals were very animated we know from the narratives of the wedding week of *Samson* (Judg. 14,10-18), although, accidentally, we in this case are told nothing of

<sup>1</sup>) The authenticity of the word is not certain, but see *Wildeboer's* remarks in his commentary in *Marti's* series, p. X.

<sup>2</sup>) This also must put a question-mark at the remarks of *Engnell*, p. 48, cf. above p. 127, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup>) *Hempel*, p. 25.

wedding songs, but of *riddles* by which the men taunted one another, — and also from the parabolical sayings of Jesus.

To the wedding belong the *descriptions* of the bodily beauty of bride and bridegroom in the Song of Solomon, which are analogous to the modern Arabic *wasf*. But some poems in this collection seem to be common love-songs, not especially connected with weddings (e.g. 1,7–8; 1,9–17; 2,8–14)<sup>1</sup>). *Egyptian* poetry has given us beautiful parallels<sup>2</sup>), and the same is the case among the modern *Syrians* whose popular poetry was collected by *Wetzstein* (cf. II).<sup>3</sup>)

All this seems to belong to the “purely profane” sphere. But we must not be deceived by our modern secularized views. When we read *Ps. 45* with its prophetic introduction and the concluding blessing, and note the religious character in the description of the divine king in its central section, which also has an unmistakable appearance of being a *wasf*, describing the beauty and splendour of the god-king (“thou art fairer than the children of men..”), then we perceive the religious character of wedding songs. This psalm is the *wedding-benediction*, spoken by a prophet to the divine king<sup>4</sup>). But the same benediction we hear in *Gen. 24,60* pronounced by the relatives of the bride leaving her home, cf. *Ruth 4,11*. Moreover we know that there are elements of the Song of Songs which have been combined with cultic practices (cf. II). This indicates — to put it cautiously — that the boundary between religious and profane must be vague in this field. Upon the whole, if a religious understanding of wedding poetry was not very natural, the allegorical use of the wedding as illustrating the relations between God and Israel, e.g. in *Hosea* (Iff.) and *Ezekiel* (16 and 23), but also in the song of the vineyard (*Is. 5,1–7*), would not so promptly offer itself to the authors of OT poems, as in fact it does. Surely, we must accustom ourselves to understand that even the most sensuous poems in the Song of Songs can belong to wedding-ceremonies which were as religious as any Protestant wedding ritual<sup>5</sup>).

To describe the “types” of love-poetry is difficult. In fact, we are here in the same position as in the preceding paragraphs, that the types seem to intersect one another. We find the *form* of “*prayer*” in the very opening verses

<sup>1</sup>) *Eissfeldt*, p. 98.

<sup>2</sup>) *Erman*, *Literatur der Ägypter*, pp. 302ff. *Barton*, *Archaeology and the Bible*, pp. 515ff.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. also *Hinrich Johansen* (cf. p. 126, n. 2), pp. 66ff. *St. H. Stephan*, *Modern Palestinian parallels to the Song of Songs* (1923) (*Journ. of the Pal. Or. Soc.* vol. II, pp. 199ff.).

<sup>4</sup>) I do not understand how *Weiser*, *Die Psalmen I* (1950), is able to label *Ps. 45* “the only example of profane lyrics in the Psalter”. — I am more inclined to connect it with the *hieròs gámos!*

<sup>5</sup>) Cf. *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet I*, p. 48, n. 1, where there is a really necessary corrective to the usual view.



of the Song of Songs and also in other places (2,14 ff.; cf. 8,6). There is also the *alluring call*, possibly connected with the custom known from some Bedouin clans, where the bride escapes into the desert pursued by the bridegroom, so that their bridal night is spent in the open. During this exciting hunt the bridegroom coaxes the bride (4,8). In a similar situation probably also 1,5 f. and 1,7 f. are at home. Here the girl is depicted as roaming about among the shepherds. Further, we find the form of *conjuring* again (cf. below, p. 133), cf. 2,7 and especially 4,16, reminding of David's curse against the mountains of Gilboa (2 Sam. 1,21, cf. Is. 5,6). Many times we come upon the *antiphonal song* (1,9-2,3; 2,8-13; 2,14-3,5; 4,12-5,1, the conclusion here applies the form of the drinking song!); 5,2-6,3; the great description of the bride in ch. 7 also uses this form in the beginning; 8,13-14). Further we may note the purely *narrative* form, describing the bliss of love (2,4-7). Some descriptions of the yearning of love remind us of the descriptions of trouble in the psalms of lamentation (4,9; 8,6). Expressions of *unhappiness* in love we see in the imitation of the complaint of the deceived husband in Is. 5,1 ff. (cf. p. 179), in Hosea's description of the adultery of his wife (Hos. 1,1 ff.; but this is only an indirect evidence proving that songs of unhappy love may have existed, the chapter being in biographical form), and in the drastic allegories of Ezekiel (16 and 23). One single piece reminds us of the *description of a dream*, perhaps related to prophetic literature (5,1 ff.)<sup>1</sup>. Of special importance are the *descriptive songs* which tell in detail of the beauty of the bodies of bride and bridegroom, especially ch. 7. In such pieces we now and then find the characteristic phrase "Behold, thou art fair..." (1,15; 4,1; 6,4; cf. 6,14; 7,6, and Ps. 45,3).

The *metaphors* used in the descriptions are often not quite perspicuous for us. We find it difficult to see how a nose comparable to the "tower of Lebanon which looketh toward Damascus" can be beautiful (7,5). Nor is the naïve indulgence in the descriptions of the naked bodily beauty of the girl and the man in accord with modern taste<sup>2</sup>). But we must remember a peculiarity of the comparisons used in the Orient. Orientals fix the eye on one single striking point, which according to our conceptions is perhaps not characteristic<sup>3</sup>). Further, the object with which the human beauty is compared can be described in greater detail without any connection with the object which it is intended to elucidate, e.g. when the *wasf* in 4,2 compares the teeth of the bride with newly shorn and washed sheep — the pearly white of her teeth is of course in the thought of the poet — but then goes on and tells us that the sheep "every one of them bear twins, and no one is barren among them". This last feature

<sup>1</sup>) cf. Haller's commentary. — <sup>2</sup>) But is the Song of Songs in this respect not more healthy than our prudery?

<sup>3</sup>) Mowinckel, *Sangesen sang* (1919), p. 51.



has nothing to say us. But may we assume that association of ideas is caused by the "Sitz im Leben" of the poem: Is it a reminiscence of the blessings to ensure fertility, which in the next example we have to mention also plays a conspicuous part? In 7,2 her belly is compared with "a heap of wheat set about with lilies", but it is not the form which is hinted at, but rather the golden-white colour of the corn heaped up after the winnowing on the threshing floor, cf. 5,14, where the corresponding part of *his* body is described as white as ivory, or 4,3 which likens her temples to a piece of pomegranate. But what is to be made of the lilies? *Haller* thinks of the hair of the abdomen, but it is more appropriate to recall the information given by *Thoma*<sup>1)</sup> and *Jacob*<sup>2)</sup>, that heaps of corn are decorated with flowers — and this detail has nothing to do with metaphor. *Dalman*<sup>3)</sup> says that the "lilies" here replace the stones and thorns by which the corn-heaps are protected: Her "heap of corn" is not surrounded by so forbidding a fence, she is wreathed with flowers! This would be a help to understand the metaphor, if we think it inappropriate to accept the explanation that the flowers have nothing to do with the metaphor at all. This phenomenon at least is the explanation of Ps. 147,10, where the legs of a man are compared with the pillars of a house. Here the strength, not form is considered.

In modern times the Song of Songs has been connected with rites belonging to the fertility cult of the Ancient East <sup>4)</sup>. In favour of the *cult-mythological* explanation *Haller* in his commentary on ch. 7 refers to the great part played by descriptions of the naked body in ch. 4 and 7. And he asserts that this is better understood if the dance is a ritual dance connected with the cult of the vegetation gods. He stresses that only professional female dancers and prostitutes dance naked. Further he draws attention to the well-known feature of cultic nakedness in fertility-rites<sup>5)</sup>. He therefore thinks that the dancer of Cant. 7 is no common bride, but a *qedesha* performing at the festival of the vegetation deity.

This interpretation is also used to explain the connection of Cant. with *Passover* (cf. II, pp. 181f.). Here we only remark that the elements pointing to connection with vegetation rites are sufficiently explained by the assumption that the wedding songs have been influenced by the ancient poetry of "divine matrimony", or we may assume that ancient ritual songs have been

<sup>1)</sup> Ritt in d. gel. Land (1884), quoted by *Haller*.

<sup>2)</sup> Das Hohe Lied (1902), quoted by *Haller*.

<sup>3)</sup> Arbeit und Sitte I, p. 359.

<sup>4)</sup> Literature will be registered in vol. II.

<sup>5)</sup> *Chantepie de la Saussaye*, Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte I (1925), pp. 557ff.

“democratized”: Originally the songs belonged to the royal ritual, which of course was imbued with the ideology of the fertility cult<sup>1</sup>). It is a feature reminiscent of this that the bride and bridegroom in Syria are still styled “queen” and “king” — a feature also found in Cant. But this must have been absolutely forgotten when the songs of Cant. were incorporated among the Sacred Books of Judaism. We may be sure that the anathema of *Akiba* would not have been pronounced if the fervent and pious rabbi had known that the Song of Songs was a Holy Text in the sense of the fertility cults (cf. p. 30).

Especially 3,1–5 is very difficult to combine in a plausible way with the popular wedding. It seems to be an expression of “free love”, in particular v. 5 which apparently alludes to rather uncomfortable scenes in the streets of the town. But it is also possible to explain the whole as a *dream* (cf. p. 130), and this would take away some part of the indecency, because sexual dreams cannot be clothed with the same responsibility as conscious poetry; the description of the dream then becomes a naïve natural expression for the longing of love.

As mentioned above, the influence of the *Adonis*-cult is thought to reveal itself in the interest in nudity. At least it is difficult to suppose that Israelite brides would dance in that manner. In connection with ordinary weddings these features therefore must be very old formulas, handed down from time immemorial<sup>2</sup>). But even on this supposition the descriptive songs must not be regarded as obscene. *Haller* is right in stressing that the Oriental mind did not feel a minute description in naturalibus of this kind indecent. We must here quote the words of *Ad. Schlatter* to which *Hinrich Johansen* alludes in this connection<sup>3</sup>): “Wer unter uns ein hohes Lied auf die Ehe schriebe, der spräche mehr von der Herzens- und Geistesgemeinschaft. Hier ist der schöne Leib in der Pracht aller seiner Glieder die Gabe, mit der eins das andere glücklich macht. Aber der Menschenleib hat seine Schönheit auch von Gott, und so wenig der 19’Psalm mit seiner Bewunderung für die Sonne der Bibel

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet*, I p. 48, n. 1, at the end. We may suppose that wedding-poetry can have had a history of the same kind as the funeral song (cf. below, p. 135), a history of “profanation” separating it from vegetation cults without making the wedding “irreligious”.

<sup>2</sup>) This assumption can also be supported by reference to reminiscences of *wasf* found in *The Arabian Nights*, e.g. in the story of the Goldsmith from Basra. Here the prose descriptions of female beauty have just the same character as the poems of Cant. In *The Arabian Nights* these descriptions are still farther from the supposed origin in the royal ideology and the fertility cult and cultic dances of *kēdešōt*.

<sup>3</sup>) op. cit. p. 70f.



unwürdig ist oder deshalb aus ihr entfernt werden muss, ebensowenig ist das Hohelied mit seinem Lob des Menschenleibes und der Ehe ein Flecken für die Bibel und braucht deshalb nicht von ihr abgeschnitten zu werden, weil alte und neue Heiden daraus eine tierische Gier und Unsauberheit zu machen pflegen..."

Upon the whole it is perhaps too narrow an aspect to explain the feature of nakedness in wedding songs exclusively on the base of vegetation cults. *Mowinkel* has criticized *Engnell* and *Widengren* for seeming to lack a sense for the powers of ancient poets to form pictures, and also new pictures (cf. my reference, *Det sakrale kongedömmet*, p. 32). Here we should perhaps also take into account that the poems most probably have been created by *men*, and that the erotic features (nakedness etc...) are creations of the imagination of the male sex. We must not imagine that Cant. describes one individual bride. Like all ancient poetry of the kinds used in ceremonies the description is typical. The bride of Cant. is as typical as the suffering servant of God in the psalms of lamentation. It has been sung at thousands of weddings of thousands of brides. If it suited one of them nobody could control, for of course the bride did not dance naked, but was dressed up in all her glory of bridal clothes while dancing.

We still have to add some words concerning the *formularium* of wedding poetry. As in Egyptian poems, the beloved girl is called "sister"<sup>1)</sup>. Frequently we find erotic symbols taken from the realm of *vegetation*, especially the vineyards — a motif also developed by Isaiah (5,1ff.)<sup>2)</sup>. Previously we have referred to the bridal *benediction*, the blessing of the bride, as a sign of the religious character of the wedding festival. The example found in Gen. 24,60 has its peculiar form. While Ps. 45 and Ruth 4,11 clearly are benedictions, Yahweh being invoked as the giver of blessing, Gen. 24,60 has the form of *conjuring*, *incantation*, which we met in working songs and elsewhere, the characteristic feature of which was the powerful imperative of the poet. This is here spoken by the kinsfolk to the departing bride who is commanded to multiply into thousands of tenthousands. In Ps. 45,17 we have the form of a *wish*, and the same form is used in Cant. 7,3, which does not talk of the "navel" (that is an euphemism of later times), but of the vulva,<sup>3)</sup> which is blessed by the wish that it may always be filled with mixed wine, this metaphorical phrase alluding to constant fecundation which the ancients accepted as a very elegant and ingenious form of the powerful wedding benediction. The fulfilment of this wish is the right of the bride, a right which is also protected by the laws, in the case where the husband loses his love for her, cf. Ex. 21,10, maintaining the sexual rights even of a female slave. A contrast

<sup>1)</sup> cf. AOT, p. 30f.; *Barton*, op. cit., p. 516.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. below p. 179 and *Haller* to Cant. 1,5; *Barton*, p. 518.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. the lexicon of *Ges.* — *Buhl.*



to these blessings and benevolent incantations is the *curse* hurled by the deceived husband against the unfaithful wife, used by Isaiah in his ingenious allegory ch. 5,6<sup>1)</sup>, where the curse is the same as that pronounced by David against the hills of Gilboa, that rain may no longer fructify them. In the erotic allegory, which is here re-interpreted by Isaiah in a religious sense, the original meaning has been: May she never have any chance of getting with child<sup>2)</sup>.

In most of these bridal benedictions we have the form of a conjuring imperative or *jussive*, without the express mention of the name of God. That does not mean that they are "irreligious" or "magical". But it is possible that we have here an older form which has been superseded by the benediction, in which Yahweh is described as the creator of the blessing, cf. the younger passage Ruth 4,11. But we must be careful not to postulate anything like a scheme of evolution. In Gen. 1,28 (P) the bridal incantation is spoken by God himself. In this way the old form of conjuring has been transformed into a benediction: Yahweh alone is capable of pronouncing the effective incantations; cf. also the imperative in Gen. 12,2, in a benediction outside the wedding sphere, but surely related to it, all the blessings making the patriarchs multiply and grow into great nations.

In connection with the wedding poetry we may briefly refer to pieces used at *childbirth*, i.e. at the fulfilment of the bridal benediction. To this category belong words like Gen. 4,4 and other passages combined with the *naming* of children: Gen. 29,31-30,24, or a prayer like the Nunc dimittis (Lk. 2,29ff., cf. v. 34 and 1,68-79 (esp. v. 70)). Benedictions spoken on the occasion of the birth of princes have been imitated by the Messianic promises in Is. 9,1ff. and 11,1ff. Oracles as Gen. 16,11ff. and 25,23, cf. Judg. 13,3ff. also belong to this category. The famous Immanuel-passage (Is. 7,10-17) refers in v. 14 to a formula used in the royal house to inform the king of the character of the child which is to be born. The situation may be similar to that of Gen. 16,11ff., and 25,23, cf. also the descriptions Jer. 20,15, Job. 3,4. But the most striking parallel is found in a *Ras Shamra* text, Nikal-Kōtarot, 6 (Syria, 1936, pp. 209-228)<sup>3)</sup>.

*Literature:* cf. II. On Is. 5,1ff.: Archiv für Orientforschung 1927, p. 209f.

Modern Palestinian formulas to the bride leaving her home in *H. Granqvist*, Marriage Conditions in a Palestinian village II (1935), pp. 74ff.; cf. also Birth and Childhood among the Arabs (1947), pp. 76 for words of announcement of the birth.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 179.- <sup>2)</sup> cf. the curses of *Lear*, Act. I, scene IV, 299ff.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Engnell*, Studies in Divine Kingship (1943), pp. 132ff. *C. B. Hansen* in Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift 1940, p. 47, and the important article of *Hammershaimb*, ibid. 1945 (in English, Studia Theologica III, 2, 1950-51, pp. 124ff.), cf. my commentary on Is. I, p. 61.

### Funeral Songs.

The *Mourning Song*, in Hebrew: *kināh* or *nēhī*, finds its "place in life" at funerals. It is sung by professional "mourning men and women" (Jer. 9,16, cf. Amos 5,16-17) or by the relatives and others connected with the deceased (2 Sam. 1,17; 3,33). It was accompanied by the music of the flute (Mt. 9,23). The sarcophagus of *Ahiram* from *Byblos* (ca. 1200 B.C.) is ornamented with pictures of old fashioned realism, showing the wailing women in action. Stripped to the waist two of them beat their hands against their breasts, two others their heads as if they would tear off the hair in passionate sorrow<sup>1</sup>). The motif is repeated with Greek moderation on a sarcophagus from *Sidon*, probably made in *Attica* under the influence of the art of *Praxiteles*, ca. 400 B.C.<sup>2</sup>).

The funeral song, the dirge, belongs to the types often imitated by the prophets in order to make the people understand the imminence of catastrophe. The lament for the dead (Jer. 22,18ff.) is often distinguishable by means of the introductory 'ēk or 'ēkā, "Oh, how (different)!", also dominating the style of the Book of Lamentations imitating the mourning for the dead<sup>3</sup>). It was originally connected with *cults of the dead* and has probably also a remote connection with the lament for the *dead god*<sup>4</sup>). Both have been repelled through the exclusiveness of Yahweh claiming his sole kingdom over his people. Therefore *Hempel*<sup>5</sup>) characterizes the history of the *kināh* as the history of its "profanation". That will in our opinion mean that it is no longer connected with a "cult of the dead" or with a dead foreign god. But it does not mean that the funeral is "irreligious". The funeral is the last duty to the dead, certainly e.g. involved in the commandment of the Decalogue concerning the reverence to be shown to parents, and therefore a religious duty. Consequently the dirges are also religious rites.

The oldest, and the most beautiful, example in the OT, *David's* lament on the death of *Saul* and *Jonathan*, for some unknown cause called "the Song of the Bow" (2 Sam. 1,18 - perhaps a hopelessly corrupted text) is outwardly quite profane. Only the *curse* against the battlefield where the lamented warriors met their death (v. 21) has the character of an *incantation*<sup>6</sup>). *David's* second,

<sup>1</sup>) A fine reproduction in S. A. Cook, *The Religion of Palestine in the Light of Archaeology* (1930), pl. VI, nr. 1.

<sup>2</sup>) Reprod. e.g. in *Springer*, *Geschichte der Kunst I* (1921), p. 326, cf. S. A. Cook, op. cit. p. 94, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. II.

<sup>4</sup>) *Hempel*, *Althebr. Lit.* p. 28.

<sup>5</sup>) p. 29.

<sup>6</sup>) cf. above, p. 125.



less inspired, funeral song, more marked by its character of political demonstration that *David* had no part in the murder of *Abner* (2 Sam. 3,33ff.), in our ears has still less of a religious tone. The same is true of the affecting fragment of a funeral song for *Zedekiah*, preserved in Jer. 38,22, of course created by the prophet in the usual style. But as we have often said, we must be cautious in postulating "profanity" of such pieces.

That so perfect a poem as 2 Sam. 1,17ff. appears at the beginning of the history of Israel demonstrates the greatness of the poetry of Israel at a very early age. *Eissfeldt* says that the development can hardly have begun with so finished productions<sup>1)</sup>. But again we must be cautious. The assumption is not a safe one. For e.g. in the field of the relation of history the story of the succession of *David*<sup>2)</sup> in the latter part of 2 Sam. has never been surpassed<sup>3)</sup>. At all events, the lament of *David* here and there, e.g. already in the introductory parts, exhibits an independence of form which is characteristic of the great poet, unfettered by conventional considerations: The characteristic 'ek, "how!" does not stand at the very beginning of the poem, as its first word. It does not occur till the third stichos of the poem, after a solemn description of the situation. After the prohibition to tell the disaster in the streets of Ascalon and other enemy towns, and after the incantation-curse against the ill-fated fields of Gilboa, follows, in accordance with the rules of the funeral lamentation, a description of the glorious past of the heroes, but here with great effect placed after the story of their humiliation in their death. The following lines on the unbroken communion of souls between them, so disharmonious with the facts of history<sup>4)</sup>, are in spite of the insincerity of great beauty. The poem then turns to the people, to the women who have so often gone to meet the heroes returning from victorious battles with songs and dances, and exhorts them to lament. The conclusion returns to the mourning words of the introduction, but with a variation making the poem end with words on the friend *Jonathan*. The word "*my brother*" used here belongs to the stable phraseology of the dirges, but here it is animated by new life through the expression of the manly friendship between the two confederates, the poet and *Jonathan*. Here undoubtedly a sincere feeling breaks through in the poem

<sup>1)</sup> p. 104.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. below, pp. 243 ff.

<sup>3)</sup> Similar cases are found in other fields of the history of literature, e.g. in the Danish historical literature (cf. *V. la Cour*, *Danmarks Historie* I, p. 160). But on the other hand, a development sometimes can be traced up to the great work (cf. *Oluf Friis*, *Den danske Litteratur Historie* I (1945) pp. 62ff.), reminding us not to be too dogmatically "anti-evolutionistic".

<sup>4)</sup> 1 Sam. 22,8b! – But cf. *Rowley*, *The Growth of the OT*, p. 68.



which is marred by the manifest untruthfulness of v. 23, where death has induced the poet to cover sins in order to speak good words of the dead friend.

One of the most finished *imitations* of the funeral song we meet in the dirge of *Jeremiah* on his people (9,16ff.). Being a prophetic address it is of course introduced by the usual prophetic formula of the oracular style. Then follows an exhortation to call the professional singers of funeral songs, "*the cunning women*". This expression seems obscure. *Giesebrecht* has assumed that these women have also practised other secret tricks. I think it probable that we have here an analogy to the French "*sage-femme*" meaning a midwife: Like the midwife who helps men to be born the "*cunning women*" by means of their songs at the funeral – originally belonging to the cult of the dead – helped the dead back to the womb of Mother Earth<sup>1</sup>). – The poem begins with a prophetic description of the situation in which Yahweh conjures up the doom<sup>2</sup>), and not until then do we encounter the characteristic 'ēk, followed by a description of the horrors of death, as usual depicted on the background of former glory. Then comes a motivation for the lament, pointing to the imminent exile. Then the prophetic discourse turns into a threatening speech, the prophet conjuring up a situation characteristic of the time of woe: the women shall no longer teach their children merry songs, but from childhood they shall be educated to become professional funeral singers. As motif the prophet introduces the weird picture of Death who in the shape of a pillaging soldier storms the city and kills great and small. This vision of personified Death might well be a line from a funeral song. We get the impression that the prophet has heard single strophes of the lament and now weaves them together in his characteristic, fragmentary way of ecstatic speech<sup>3</sup>). – In spite of the fresh start in v. 21 (the new introductory formula) it seems that the next piece of vision again might be of the same sort of funeral verses. The impressive figure of Death as harvester has been deplorably marred by an interpolator who in the first line added the meaningless "as dung". When this word is excised the dirge describes how the fallen are lying in rows in the fields as heaps of corn behind the harvestman, but useless, for there follows nobody who will gather in. The lines remind us of the introduction to the lament on Jonathan.

Short and impressive, too, is *Amos's* dirge on the virgin Israel, the young woman thrown to the ground by death (5,2).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Mowinkel*, "Moder Jord" i det gamle testament, in *Religionshistoriska studier tillägnade Edv. Lehmann...* 1927, pp. 135ff.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. David's lament, above p. 136.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. below, p. 195.

While these imitations (cf. also Zech. 11,1-3) in spite of their character as *prophetic curses* are saturated with the *pity* for the dead which must be a natural element in a funeral dirge, in other places we find the form of the mourning song used in order to *deride* the enemies. The mourning song is then transformed into a *taunting song* which like other mocking verses intend to conjure ill luck and curse upon the wicked<sup>1</sup>). In the great gibe against the king of Babel (Is. 14,4ff.) the poem is styled *māšāl*. But the introductory *'ēk* indicates that it is the form of funeral dirge which is used as incantation to kill the enemy. The grand description of the difference between past and present, the king's former greatness and present humiliation, spoken by the choir of his colleagues rising to their feet in Hades to greet him, is the usual theme of the funeral: "Ah, how different!"

Typical examples are also found Ez. 19,1-14; 26,17-18, probably continued 27,3-9 and 26-36; cf. 32,2-16. *Nahum's* book is concluded by a short funeral dirge on the king of Asshur (3,18-19) also with the character of a taunting song (cf. also Hab. 2,6ff.).

The style of the funeral dirge has also been of importance in the composition of Is. 53. But here the outlook of the dirge has been changed. Its description of misery is regarded as the foundation of the victory of the Servant of Yahweh. „Past and present" have been reversed. While the common dirge speaks of the former glory and present wretchedness Is. 53 describes the humble figure, innocent suffering, and death to the benefit of others, and promises in reward the glory of a new life.

Imitations of the funeral dirge we also find in the *Book of Lamentations*. Here, in chs. 1,2, and 4 this style is used allegorically of Jerusalem, while ch. 5 is a regular psalm of lamentation for the nation (cf. p. 154f.), and ch. 3 a psalm of lamentation of mixed character, an "I" speaking in the name of the nation (cf. p. 154).

### *War Poetry.*

A great deal of the ancient lyric poetry preserved in the Bible is connected with *war*, war being a culmination of life in Ancient Israel<sup>2</sup>). From this sphere come *victory hymns* like the *Song of Deborah*. Here we can definitely perceive that this is no "profane" song. For it is clearly a *psalm*. This appears not only in its introduction and conclusion, but also in its corpus where the description of the miserable times experienced by the people before the war of liberation

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Eissfeldt*, pp. 98f. and 107.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Johs. Pedersen*, *Israel III-IV*, pp. 1ff.

is best understood as the “*confession*”<sup>1)</sup> of the psalms of thanksgiving describing the suffering from which God has brought salvation. The psalm of Judg. 5 also contains elements of *praise* (“benediction”), and *blame* on the valiant and the cowards, *curse* against the disloyal allies, *taunting verses* on the conquered enemy. As a whole the composition must be styled a *psalm of thanksgiving for victory*, probably sung at a solemn festival at some sanctuary in the territory of the tribes involved in the war of liberation. As such it is interesting, because it is an example of this type of poetry (described below in the chapter on the psalms) which we are able to connect with a concrete event. But we also see that no *formal* peculiarities connect it with “war poetry”: this is a determination made on the grounds of contents, not of style.

With war certain *conjuring songs* are connected. An example is *Jos. 10,12–13*. Against *Hylmö*<sup>2)</sup> who thinks that it has been preserved in full integrity, because early songs are supposed to have been short, I, with most interpreters<sup>3)</sup>, am inclined to assume, that it is a *fragment* of a victory song. This is made probable by the second line, relating the result of the incantation. The victory song has told of an episode during the battle. Time did not suffice to reap all advantages of victory (cf. 1 Sam. 14,24ff)<sup>4)</sup>. The leader conjured the sun and moon to stop in their courses. As in Gen. 24,60 the incantation has the form of imperative conjuring, not of prayer or wish (cf. also the Song of the Well). – The motive – the lengthening of time – is also found in Is. 38,8. – A similar line of incantation is also found by *Hylmö* in the difficult passage *Ex. 17,16* which may perhaps with the Swedish Authorized Translation be rendered: “Surely, with (my) hand (raised) to the throne of Yahweh (I swear): War has Yahweh against Amalek from generation to generation”. Here the conjuror mobilizes the war-power of Yahweh against the hated neighbour, that Amalek may never have “peace”, i.e. that he may be utterly destroyed. The incantation here invokes Yahweh. But that the conjuror raises his hand is perhaps not, as supposed by the Swedish translation, a gesture of swearing an oath, cf. the preceding narrative in which the army leader forces the victory down upon his people by constantly keeping his powerful hands lifted to heaven. Of exactly the same kind is the verse of the *victory-arrow against*

<sup>1)</sup> cf. below, p. 153.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 11.

<sup>3)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 111; *Noth*, in his commentary ad. loc.

<sup>4)</sup> This is not altered if the explanation offered by *H. H. Rowley* in *The Re-Discovery of the OT* (1945), p. 67f. is accepted: The sun and moon are not stopped, but veiled by clouds of the morning so that Israel's attack was veiled by darkness.



*Aram of Elisha* (2 Ki. 13,27). Here also the powerful name Yahweh is pronounced to create victory.

Related to such incantations intended to ruin the enemies is the *magic rite* known from Egypt, where the enemy-nations get their names written on clay pots which then are smashed in order to create ill-luck for the enemies (cf. Ps. 149,7<sup>1</sup>). In this connection we also have to mention the *curses and benedictions spoken by prophets and other "men of God" before battle*. The pericope of *Balaam* (Num. 22ff.) illustrates their place in life: before the fighting starts a seer filled with divine power must curse the foes and bless the friends that the battle may have the lucky issue. This is bound up with the idea of "*sanc-tifying the war*"<sup>2</sup>). To the category of incantation, but of the beneficent kind, belong the so-called "*Words of Signal*", by which the Ark of the Covenant was greeted on its going out and return (Num. 10,35ff.), cf. also Ps. 68,1. By these incantations the power of Yahweh concentrated in the Ark is linked to the armies of Israel and sent out against the enemies. – To the same end are directed the *curses* hurled by a single warrior like Goliath against his opponent before the fight (1 Sam. 17,8–10,43–44), as well as the more inarticulate roar in which the warriors give vent to their lust for fighting (1 Sam. 4,5f.)<sup>3</sup>). *Mockery* and *curse* are means of the same kind, and the *taunting song* has of course been an important element in the lyrics of war. It is an ancient form of "war of nerves", carried out through ritual words and roaring and yelling to secure victory. Also the more articulate war-cry of *Gideon's* men must be mentioned here (Judg. 7,18). We also find that the enemy is addressed and advised not to fight (2 Chron. 13,4–14.; 2 Sam. 2,25ff.). Before the battle *songs* are sung to inflame the warriors (cf. Is. 42,13), just as modern warfare makes use of stirring music to excite the troops. Such a song we find as part of the *Deborah-hymn* (Judg. 5,12), cf. also the imitation in Is. 51,9–11, reminding Yahweh of his great deeds in the past to excite him to new efforts, here connected with a psalm of lamentation with an oracular answer in v. 12–16. A similar exciting song of revolutionary character we meet in 2 Sam. 20,1, which according to 1 Ki. 12,16 seems to have become a sort of "*Marseil-laise*" to the Northern Kingdom.

After the victory the conquerors *boasted* of their valour. This also appears in the Song of Deborah. A grim example is the boasting of *Lamech* (Gen. 4,23).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. my article in *Teologisk Tidskrift* (1929), pp. 60ff., and further Jer. 19, 10ff., and e.g. *Chantepie de la Saussaye*, *Lehrb. d. Rel. gesch.* I, p. 573. – Also *Oudtest. Stud.* VIII, pp. 85ff.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Johs. Pedersen*, *Israel* III–IV, pp. 8–18.

<sup>3</sup>) Concerning the significance of *noise* in this connection cf. *Johs. Pedersen*, *Israel*, III–IV, p. 17.

The brawler turns to the *women* coming out to meet the heroes with songs and dances (cf. Judg. 12,34). A song accompanying these dances is preserved by 1 Sam. 18,7, cf. 29,5. A religious element in a song of this kind is found in the hymn of *Miriam* (Ex. 15,20ff.), of which the great hymn for the accession festival of Yahweh in the beginning of the chapter might be an expansion, unless the real solution of the problem is that both of the two old strata have had the hymn which the redactor did not take the trouble to render in extenso the second time. The Song of Deborah also contains *mocking verses* against the conquered foes. Such verses are also used in the description of the victory festival held by the Philistines in celebration of their capture of Samson (Judg. 16,23ff.). These verses are remarkable by their many *assonances*, reminding us of the taunting rhymes cried by children after their enemies. The Song of *Miriam* shows how the song of victory easily gets the tones of the hymn, just like the Song of Deborah.<sup>1)</sup> The consequence must be the assumption that many of these songs are cultic songs connected with religious festivals celebrating victories.

Whether *Num. 21,14-15* is a fragment of an old war song it is impossible to say on account of the fragmentary state of the text, but the mention of the "Book of Yahweh's Wars" might recommend the assumption.<sup>2)</sup>

#### *Patriarchal Words.*

Related to benedictions spoken or sung at the beginning of war are *benedictions and curses spoken by the patriarchs*. The relation is primarily a *formal* one and again shows how the whole classification of species ought to be revised so that the programme of Gunkel should be more consistently worked out on purely formal lines. The poems here referred to are especially spread over *Genesis* (12,1ff.; 14,9f.; 22,16ff.; 27,27ff.; 27,39ff.; 28,13ff.; 48,15f.; 48,20; cf. ch. 49 and its parallel in Deut. 33, and Gen 9,25). To this category also 2 Sam. 23, called "the Last Words of David", belongs, although formally this "prophecy" is of a Wisdom Literature type like Ps. 1<sup>3)</sup>.

These poems have something to do with the political and economic circumstances of the tribes. Several of them are in the narratives introduced as *aetiology*, i.e. as explanation of the ill-luck or good-luck of nations and families as revealed in their circumstances of living. Most of these poems seem to be old verses which have lived on the tongues of the people, and

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Johs. Pedersen's* fine analysis of the poem, *Israel III-IV*, pp. 3-8.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 102.

<sup>3)</sup> *Mowinkel*, in the Norwegian translation II, pp. 296ff.



they have their background in the belief that the men filled with "blessing", with the power of chiefs and kings and poets, were able to *create the future* of their descendants. Formally therefore these lays are related to the *incantation*. But such poems have at an early date been developed into works of art, as it is probably seen in the benedictions of *Gen. 49* and *Deut 33* and the lays of *Balaam*. Here the bards sanction the political circumstances of their times through the words of some patriarch or famous seer<sup>1</sup>). It is easily noticed that these lays are also related to the types of *prophecy*. It has also been said that they have something of the character of *National Anthems*. Gunkel in his commentary on *Gen.* refers to illuminating parallels from ancient and modern times – from Antiquity<sup>2</sup>): The Ascension of Moses, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the *Iliad* 16 and 22, the *Aeneid* 6, Xenophon's *Cyrop.* VIII, Plato, *Apol.* 1,90, Cicero, *De Divinatione* 1,30 – and from modern literature: Cranmer's prophecy in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII* (Act V, sc. 5). We can add the vaticinia ex eventu-historiography of Apocalyptic literature (e.g. *Dan. 11*), and from German literature the prophecy of Joan of Arc in Schiller's *Die Jungfrau von Orléans*.

Concerning the *place in life* of such poems it is difficult to form an opinion, because we cannot be sure that their present position in the narratives of the Pentateuch and elsewhere is of any relevance to the question. The benedictions of *Balaam* are placed in a situation described above: as part of the preparation for war. But it is uncertain if this is their original context.

The history of *Balaam's prophecies* is rather complicated. They seem to be of different ages. The two oldest of them (24,3–9 and 15–19) are commonly believed to have been handed down by the *Yahwistic source* (J). They have nothing to do with the time of immigration, but describe Israel as dwelling in the land of Canaan, the use of the word "camping-places" being purely poetical (cf. 2 Sam. 20,1; 1 Ki. 12,16). The scenery described in them is obviously the landscape of Canaan with gardens along the rivers, oaks and cedars. The land is governed by a *king*. Therefore it is most probable that they are *vaticinia ex eventu* and speak of *David* who has subdued Edom and Moab. These originally independent strophes have been adopted by the Yahwistic variant of the *Balaam*-legend. – The *Elohistic source* has in its variant of the legend two other poems (23,7–10 and 18–24). They differ from the two older poems in that they presuppose the legend and therefore must have been composed to be part of it. They are also dependent upon the two older poems, having borrowed some phrases from them. They have no connections with the golden age of David, no allusions to the conquest of Edom and Moab, but speak in more general terms of the inner happiness of Israel: its religious strength, expressed by the cries of homage to the king Yahweh in the accession ceremonies and by the possession of true prophecy. Israel's bliss is also here pictured through the splendid isolation in which the

<sup>1</sup>) *Hylmö*, p. 15.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Reuss*, *Das Alte Testament III*, p. 110.



chosen people lives, privileged by its God, separated from the nations. – Not until after the combination of the sources have the *three youngest* verses been adopted in the context, the poems of Amalek, the Kenites, and the Chittim. The last poem (24,23) perhaps alludes to *Alexander the Great*, while the two others are older<sup>1</sup>).

From all this it follows that only the two older poems are “original” representatives of the species, while the others are younger imitations. And it is, further, clear that these original poems are not seen in their original context, explaining their place in real life. The same is the case in the contexts of Gen. 49 and Deut. 33. Both have been adopted by the later prose-sources, and in Deut. 33 the blessings of the tribes have been set in the frame of a *psalm*. If we should say something of the poems and their practical function we must start not in the context, but in the poems themselves and examine the indications given in their proper texts, to see whether we can locate the place in life mirrored in the poems themselves. This is the principle used in the cultic interpretation of the Psalms.

Now, in this respect Deut. 33 is most explicit. The Psalm forming the frame of the benedictions, with its description of a theophany culminating in Yahweh's taking power as king, is distinctly a psalm for the accession festival of Yahweh. The whole composition has the character of a *liturgy* (cf. pp. 159 ff), and therefore we may with some probability assume the existence of a ceremony in which the benedictions were spoken over the people, tribe by tribe, perhaps in some connection or other with the anniversary of the covenant. To this event certain psalms (50, 81, 95) are referred. Perhaps Deut. 27, too, gives some sort of illustration. Here we find “benedictions” pronounced over the nation. The two younger poems of the Balaam-legend (the Elo-histic stratum) also allude to the accession festival. We may therefore combine the benedictions with the festival common to the organisation called by *Noth* “the Israelite Amphictyony”<sup>2</sup>). But in this combination there is a difficulty in the polemic verses in Gen. 49 which direct virtual *curses*, not blessings against some of the tribes. In Deut. 33 some tribes are passed over in silence. But if we remember that both phenomena have their parallels in the Song of Deborah, we may assume that the polemic and the silence in the “blessings” have their explanation in the background of a period when the amphictyony was engaged in conflict with some of its members, because they had broken their obligations and accordingly were liable to

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Mowinkel*, *Bileamsagnet*, in *Edda* 1930, pp. 191ff., also in *ZATW* 1930, pp. 233ff.; *Eissfeldt*, *Die Komposition der Bileam-Erzählung*, *ZATW* 1939, pp. 212ff.; *Albright*, in *JBL*, 1944, pp. 204ff.

<sup>2</sup>) *Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels* (1930).

sanctions from the faithful members of the league of tribes. The silentium may be explained on the same line as the absence of e.g. Judah in the Song of Deborah, that the tribes not named were at the time of the composition not members of the league. According to *Noth* Judg. 20-21 must be understood as a story of war carried on towards a disloyal member of the amphictyony.

These assumptions concerning the two collections of blessings in Gen. 49 and Deut. 33 lead to the result that these benedictions and curses are in reality forms of *cultic oracles*<sup>1)</sup>. And this may consequently also be the explanation of the other benedictions and curses of the patriarchs.

In an article in the *Gemser Jubilee Volume*<sup>2)</sup> I have proposed another solution of the problem presented by the curses. I compare Gen. 49 and Deut 33 with small prophetic "books" (cf. Obadiah), emanating from cultic ceremonies similar to those explaining the Egyptian Execration Texts. In the annual festival of the community the curses against outside enemies and sinners inside the people are a *means of purification*, aiming at the execution of Yahweh's judgment against sinners, while the benedictions are means of strengthening the good forces. Imitating such rites curses and benedictions were described as spoken by patriarchs, especially in their hour of death, creating the future of their descendants.

All this has led us very far into a theory of a cultic use of these poems. Again we perceive the impossibility of a "purely profane" form of literature in Israel's old poetry. We have met many signs of this in nearly all the preceding paragraphs. Especially have we met many poems with a character of incantation, curse, benediction, etc. But we have in some cases, too, seen specimina justifying a "profane" interpretation. We shall therefore from all this infer a warning against both a one-sided cultual and a one-sided profane interpretation. Every kind of dogmatism must be avoided<sup>3)</sup>.

#### *Historical localisation and collections of songs.*

Like the *Psalms*<sup>3)</sup> many of the old poems mentioned in the previous paragraphs have been combined with *historical situations*. We find them handed down to us in the framework of history in the Pentateuch and the Historical Books. This however means that they sometimes, by the editors of these books, have been *re-interpreted*. Thus, the Song of the Well (Num. 21,17-18) has been combined with the town *Be'er*, "Well", in Transjordan and with an historical situation from the wanderings of Israel, and in this connection

<sup>1)</sup> cf. below, pp. 188 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> Hervormde Teologiese Studies, Pretoria 1951. cf. also Oudtestamentische Studien VIII, pp. 85ff., on Amos 1-2.

re-interpreted, wrongly, as a taunting song similar to that against Moab in the same chapter, v. 27-30: It has presumably been understood as an ironical appeal to the town, that it had better surrender, the words of digging with the staffs of the chiefs being taken as an allusion to the breaching of the town-wall.<sup>1)</sup>

Similar historical localisations also appear in Ex. 17,16 and other passages. The position of the poems in the Pentateuch is analogous to the well-known insertion of *Psalms* in other historical books<sup>2)</sup>. In some cases the poems perhaps are the nuclei around which the narratives have been formed<sup>3)</sup>. We also see that, just as the psalms have been misunderstood by those who inserted them in the historical books<sup>4)</sup>, so the same thing has happened to many of the other poems. *The Song of Deborah* has not been misunderstood, owing to the quite distinct historical character of this poem. But both the *Song of the Well* and the verse on *Sihon's* conquest of *Heshbon* have been interpreted wrongly by the editor<sup>5)</sup>. We also have seen that the two oldest *Balaam-songs* are older than their prose context and have nothing to do with the wanderings in the desert.

Several of the quotations of the old poems indicate that early *collections* of songs have been in existence before the old sources of the Pentateuch and the historical books took the poems up in their narratives. Num. 21,14 mentions "*The Book of the Wars of Yahweh*", probably an anthology of old lays on the fights with the original inhabitants of Canaan. Another collection is referred to in Jos. 10,13; 2 Sam. 1,18, and 1 Ki. 8,13 (here only in some Greek witnesses, as v. 53a according to the numbering of the verses in the edition of *Rahlfs*, with a scribal error: "The Book of Songs"). It is called "*The Book of Jashar*" (A. V.), or perhaps better "*The Book of the Upright*" (R. V. marg.). These collections have been lost. From later days we have the wedding songs of *Cant.*, and the obviously religious collections, the *Psalms* and the *Lamentations*. In 2 Chron. 35,25 we hear of a collection of lamentations, also said to have contained *Jeremiah's* dirge on *Josiah*, but this valuable collection has also been lost<sup>6)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 101.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. below, p. 163, and my *Forelæsninger over Indledning til de gammeltestamentlige Salmer* (1932), p. 53.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet* I, p. 62. *Engnell* tells us that this *most* frequently is the case. I am not quite sure of the "most", and especially not concerning the example given by *Engnell*, the *Song of Hannah*, 1 Sam. 2.

<sup>4)</sup> In this respect the *Song of Hannah* is a good example.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. *Mowinkel*, in the Norwegian translation I, ad. loc.

<sup>6)</sup> Concerning the relations between 2 Chron. 35,25 and the *Book of Lamentations*, cf. II.



*Literature: Bücher, Arbeit und Rhythmus* (6th ed. 1924). G. A. Smith, *The Early Poetry of Israel* (3rd ed. 1910). Causse, *Les Origines de la Poésie hébraïque* (Rev. d'Hist. et Phil. Rel. 1924, pp. 393ff.; 1925, pp. 1ff.). *Les plus vieux chants de la Bible* (1926). Literature on the *Song of Songs* will be given in II. H. Jahnou, *Das hebr. Leichenlied* (1923). Zsiros, *Der kultische Charakter des sogenannten Deboraliedes* (1923). O. Grether, *Das Deboralied* (1941). G. Gerleman, *The Song of Deborah in the Light of Stylistics* (*Vetus Testamentum* 1951, pp. 168ff.).

Concerning the theory of *profane songs of the king*, cf. below, p. 148.

Eissfeldt, *Einleitung*, pp. 96 and 101. Mowinkel, in the Norwegian translation I, ad Num. 21.

### *The Psalms.*

Regarding the poetry treated in the preceding paragraphs we have seen that we have not been able to keep up the rubric "profane poetry" to the extent supposed by the usual arrangement of the history of literature. Over and over again we found signs of religious sentiment and practice in the different works.

And especially on account of the scantiness of the material and the fragmentary form in which much of it has been handed down we have been unable to make much of formal analyses, this work apparently being the task of a coming monograph, freshly examining the types of the older poetry.

But we shall be in a much more favourable position when we now pass over to *undoubtedly religious poetry*. I again observe – for the benefit of my benevolent readers – that these words are not to be misunderstood in the sense that in principle I regard the works hitherto considered as "purely profane"; on the contrary, my aim has been, in balanced and cautious language as befits the profession, to underline the impossibility of describing Israel's poetry as "purely profane".

We now have to examine the literature known as "*psalms*", to which we in the preceding paragraphs have arrived, e.g. when we have touched Deut. 33. In the General Introduction we, however, are not only concerned with the poems found in the collection called "The Psalms". For poems of the types found in this book of the Bible are dispersed over all Holy Scripture, inserted in the historical books, imitated and produced in the same forms by the prophets, and being the foundation of many a prose prayer in the historical books, where the usual arrangement of the distinct parts of hymns or psalms of lamentation can easily be discerned in the prose form.

The *place in life* of this poetry is the *Temple*, the many *cultic functions* administered within its courtyards. A series of such functions is given in the *prayer of Solomon* at the dedication of the sanctuary, attributed to the royal founder by a Deuteronomistic author in 1 Ki. 8,31ff. Here we get a comparatively long, but nevertheless not exhaustive, list of the situations in which psalms were chanted.

The *main types* are according to common opinion, 1) "collective" or "national" psalms: Hymns, psalms of thanksgiving or of lamentation of "collective" form, i.e. poems with the congregation or – what is the same at least in the early days – the nation as human subject; it must be noted that the word "national" has only its sociological meaning, without involving an attempt to characterize the patriotic sentiment of the poems; and 2) "individual" psalms with a singular "I" as subject, mainly lamentations and thanksgiving psalms. The distinction between "collective" and "individual" psalms must however not be driven too far. The boundary between "individual" and "collective" is much more fluid than in our culture<sup>1)</sup>.

But further, the Book of Psalms contains types which are not proper psalms, but are e.g. more or less related to *prophetic* or perhaps better *oracular* literature, and also with incantation, such as *cultic benedictions and curses* and *cultic oracles*, sometimes combined in the complex compositions consisting of different types, the so-called *liturgies*.

In the literature on these matters some designations of poems are often taken as independent types in a somewhat perplexed way. As in the preceding chapters we also here meet the situation that determination of type based on formal criteria is crossed by determination on the basis of the contents of the poems. When scholars e.g. speak of "*royal psalms*" or of "*psalms for the accession of Yahweh to his throne*" it is misleading to array these specimens along with "hymns", "psalms of lamentation" etc. It means that two different principles of classification are used. "*Royal psalms*" e.g., regarded from stylistic points of view, comprehend different formally distinct types, both wailing (28; 61; 63) and jubilant and thankful poems (e.g. 18 and 21), also cultic oracles (2; 45; 72; 110), liturgies (20; 89; 132), and the solemn vow based on the *speculum regis* (101). Similarly, *hymns for the accession of Yahweh* and the so-called "*Songs of Zion*" ("*Zionslieder*", *Gunkel*) generally represent one single type, viz. the hymns. But for that very reason it is not appropriate to use the word "type" of a group called "*Zionslieder*" e.g.

There is another perplexing circumstance about the usual arrangement of the types. The so-called "royal psalms" are not easily distinguished from "collective" psalms. The "national" psalms sometimes exhibit a strange mixture of "individual" and "collective" sections. This has been explained differently, but now generally the "individual" subject is thought to be the king or some other person who can be regarded as the "incarnation" of the community. Of late it has been stressed that most psalms originally belonged to the royal ritual, so

<sup>1)</sup> Åke V. Ström, *Vetekornet*, p. 110f. – Engnell, *Gamla testamentet I*, p. 53. *Mowinckel*, *Offersang og Sangoffer*, pp. 45ff.; the entire ch. III; 193ff.; cf. below, p. 153, n. 2.



that all psalms or rather all types of psalms originally are "royal psalms", the subject originally being the divine king. But as time goes on the ritual is "democratized", so that the types are used also in the service of ordinary men.<sup>1)</sup>

Reference was made above<sup>2)</sup> to the theory that the Psalter contains some documents connected with the king which are thought not to be "religious", but "*profane*". As the most typical representative of this class some scholars mention Ps. 45 as a "purely worldly" poem<sup>3)</sup>. This theory of "profane royal songs" ("profane Königslieder") is supported in different ways. Scholars refer to the evidence we have of *music at court* (2 Sam. 19,36 and *Sennacherib's* words of the choirs of *Hezekiah*, in the Taylor-cylinder III, 38-39). It is also justified to conclude from 2 Sam. 23,1-7, calling David the man "whom Israel's lyrics love to sing" (*Moffatt's* translation), that songs celebrating the greatness of kings have existed. *But we have no poems of this kind preserved in the OT.* Ps. 45 is a *wedding-benediction* by a prophet<sup>4)</sup>. *Messianic prophecies* like Is. 9,1-6; 11,1-9; Micha 5,1ff., and Jer. 23,5-6, for which *Eissfeldt*<sup>5)</sup> assumes that there have existed prototypes in the form of *secular songs* of the king, in reality point back to *cultic oracles* like Ps. 72; 2; 110. The only exception might be 1 Mac. 14,6-15, the great description of the blissful time of *Simon the Maccabee*. But this is deceiving, for the age of Simon is here described after the pattern of the eschatological, Messianic prophecies of weal. Accordingly we have at the base not secular praise of the king, but *imitation of religious poetry*. Even if we may assume that poets have sung of the great kings of Israel we must maintain that nothing of this material has been preserved, just as we have nothing in the OT corresponding to the self-laudation of the kings of the great Oriental empires - the memoirs of *Nehemiah* in this respect having been modified by the influence of the religion of Judaism. The idea of a "court style" so common in the works of *Gunkel* and *Gressmann* is a rather unfortunate one when used to justify the supposition that secular lyric of this kind should have influenced the royal psalms. Of course there must have been something which can be called "court style". Rulers are always treated according to certain laws of *etiquette*. But it is a misunderstanding to think that the etiquette of the ancient kings was "secular" or "profane". On the contrary, what we call "etiquette" should in those times better be called "*ritual*", because of the divine character of kingship. "Etiquette" is not "vain flattery" (the court style is generally illustrated by reference to the

<sup>1)</sup> For further particulars I refer to my book *Det sakrale kongedømme*, where the relevant literature is registered up to 1945. <sup>2)</sup> p. 146.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. above, p. 129, n. 4. <sup>4)</sup> cf. p. 129.

<sup>5)</sup> p. 110. - A better example might be found in 1 Sam. 18, 7. But it does not praise the king, on the contrary, it praises his rival (cf. below).



rococo-monarchs, especially in Germany, who imitated the *roi soleil* at Versailles in the etiquette of their ridiculous little courts). It is the expression of working reality, symbols pregnant with divine power from the channel of blessing which kingship "by the Grace of God" – and a modern State founded on Justice – can be. Of course such symbols in the process of time may be abused by unscrupulous tyrants, so that the symbols are turned into cant, or time may leave them behind so that they have no longer any corresponding reality. But this "court style" has, where it is still living, no "profane" character. On the contrary, both in Israel and in the whole Ancient East it is saturated with religion.

"Profane" or "secular" royal songs we therefore cannot find in the OT. A "secular" tone *may* be perceived in 2 Sam 1,23–24 or in the dancing song of 1 Sam. 18,7b. But the latter has nothing to do with court, and the former comes from a funeral lamentation. I am however not sure that the procession of dancing women was not as "ritual" as the funeral dirge.

Common to all types is the *arrangement*, the *scheme*, which is however often not followed clearly and completely. Generally we can discern an *introduction*, revealing the mood of the poem and accordingly characteristically different in the different types. The introduction is followed, often in organic connection, by the *main section*, the *corpus*, divided in several smaller pieces expressing the leading idea of the song. Often there is also a distinct *conclusion* of varying contents. But introduction and conclusion may be altogether absent.

*Literature:* Gunkel, *Einleitung in die Psalmen* (1933). Mowinkel, *Psalmenstudien I–VI* (1921–24); Offersang og Sangoffer, salmediktningen i bibelen (1951). My *Indledning til de gammeltestamentlige Salmer* (1937), cf. corrections and additions in my commentary (1939). W. O. E. Oesterley, *A Fresh Approach to the Psalms* (1937).

### The Hymn.

The *style* of the hymn is in all periods of the history of Israel upon the whole homogenous, cf. e.g. Ex. 15,21 and the NT hymns in the gospel of Luke, the Magnificat and Benedictus. Its "primitive cell"<sup>1)</sup> is the ritual exclamation *Hallelujah*, and its name in Hebrew has most probably been *ḥillah*<sup>2)</sup>. The sentiment expressed in this exclamation constitutes the leading idea of the hymns. This reveals itself formally in their *introductions* which nearly always

<sup>1)</sup> Engnell takes over this expression from Gunkel (*Gamla testamentet* I, p. 57 cf. p. 53). Cf. Gyllenberg, *Finsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 1946, p. 158, and also Sten Rodhe, *Deliver us from Evil* (*Studies on the Vedic Ideas of Salvation* (Lund 1946), p. 18), on the proper understanding of "evolution" and "development" in *History of Religions*.

<sup>2)</sup> Eissfeldt, p. 119; Gunkel, *Einl. in die Ps.*, pp. 37,58f.

have the form of *imperative in plural*, bidding the congregation to praise Yahweh. But also *cohortative forms* and *jussive* in the plural are used, the latter form, however, hardly as the first word of the hymn. Often a series of such exhortations are heaped in the introitus, and some hymns can be said to consist solely of "introductory formulas", and they accordingly are only a great series of variations of the original cultic cry, cf. Ps. 150. Forms of the *singular* (imperative or jussive) occur with collective subjects, e.g. Israel, cf. Ps. 119,2 (but note the uncertain textual tradition in v. 3). More seldom is an introitus in the singular in the *voluntative* or *imperfect in the first person*.

Another form of introduction is a *description* of the jubilation, cf. 1 Sam. 2 and the Magnificat, Lk. 1. When e.g. Ps. 33, 92, 98, and 150 mention instruments of *music* in such connections we learn how the hymns were produced in the service. Lastly, the hymns sometimes begin with a *passive verbal form*, e.g. *bārūk*.

To the verbal forms in the introductions is added, in many different ways, a designation of the object of praise, the God of Israel.

Freer forms of introductions are the expressions used e.g. in Ps. 92,2ff.; 65,2, cf. the analogous introduction to the lament in Ps. 115.

Comparatively few hymns begin quite *without* an introduction but with a single weighty sentence (114,1f.; 19,8f.; Nah. 1,2; Dan. 4,31), e.g. a *rhetoric question* (8,1; 84,2). This form is frequent in hymns to the accession festival of Yahweh, when they are introduced by their characteristic phrase "*Yahweh mālāk*". This phrase can also be placed in the main section (47,9; 96,10). In Deut. 33,2-5 we have an introduction *describing the theophany* of Yahweh, culminating in a variation of the characteristic sentence. The psalm is then continued, after the inserted amphictyonic benediction of the tribes (cf. p. 143), as a typical accession festival hymn (v. 26ff.), with the hymnic "comparison of gods", "the fight of God with the nations", – common motifs in these psalms – and a description of the security of the chosen people, guaranteed according to the victory of the creator<sup>1)</sup>. – In the *Song of Deborah* (Judg. 5) the description of the theophany has been placed after the "Hallelujah-introduction", which in its turn has been enlarged by an address to an imaginary circle of kings and princes, or perhaps rather to the chieftains of the people. Also the "*Songs of Zion*" (46, 48, 76, 84, 87, cf. p. 147) have their particular introductory formulas, descriptions of Yahweh's greatness or the glory of the sanctuary, cf. also Jer. 17,12-13. The *Trishagion* (Is. 6,3) only contains two sentences, maybe from the corpus of a hymn, but it may also be an independent poem, introduced by a weighty sentence, cf. Ps. 24,1.

The *corpus* is often linked to the introduction by means of *kī*, "for", giving

<sup>1)</sup> cf. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II; Offersang og Sangoffer, ch. V.



the cause of the exhortation to praise God (Ex. 15,21, Ps. 136 et al.). But the transition from introduction to main section may also have the form of an *apposition* (cf. the hymnic introduction to the thanksgiving psalm, Ps. 18), or of a *relative clause* (cf. hymnic elements in lamentations, Ps. 16,7; 31,8; cf. 66,20; 124,6). Both apposition and relative clause are bound up with the name of God pronounced in the introduction. This form often occurs in connection with the formula *bārūk Yahuveh* (66,20; 124,6) and in prose prayers witnessing to its use in real hymns (cf. Gen. 24,27). Akin to this form of transition is the use of a *participle* in apposition to the divine name, describing the power and other great qualities of God. This form is called the “*predicative style*” (Ps. 9,12; 136,3ff.; 144,1 etc. 1)).

Introduction and corpus very seldom are placed side by side without any form of transition, but cf. 104,1; 105,7; 113,4; 115, cf. Is. 42,13; Hab. 3,19; Zeph. 3,15; Zech. 9,9.

The *nominal clause* is predominant in the syntax of the hymn. Its *principal person*, the object of praise, is of course *Yahuveh*. Generally he is referred to in the *third person*. If God is addressed it is generally not in the form of prayer, as in the lamentations, but in the form of a description of his great qualities. A *mixture* of third and second person may occur. Frequently the qualities of *Yahuveh* are praised, his limbs (anthropomorphism), his works, his gifts; all these are then introduced as subject of the clauses. What is specifically Israelite here reveals itself in the combination of the works of creation with the act of salvation at the exodus from Egypt, and, in general, in the common story of God and his people. The form known from Accadian hymns where the god praises himself (“*auto-louange style*”) is not found in the OT Psalter, but its existence in Israel is proved through the resonance of this form in the speeches of God in *Job* (38ff.), in the speech of Wisdom in Prov. 8, and Ecclus. 24, and above all in the *hymns of Deutero-Isaiah* (e.g. Is. 42,8–9; 44,24–28; 63,1–6). In Deutero-Isaiah it is possible to assume direct Babylonian influence: the prophet takes the formulas from the Babylonian gods and gives them to *Yahuveh*<sup>2)</sup>. When *Weiser*<sup>3)</sup> attributes an important part in the history of the hymn to this prophet as the creator of many of its ideas this rests upon a wrong conception, the forms of the hymn being mostly the presuppositions, not the consequences of the work of Deutero-Isaiah<sup>4)</sup>. Therefore *Eissfeldt*’s view of direct influence from Babylonian poems on the style of the prophet seems less probable.

<sup>1)</sup> Gunkel, Einl. in die Ps., p. 45f.

<sup>2)</sup> Eissfeldt, p. 120.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 29.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. my Indledning til de gammeltestamentlige Salmer, pp. 37ff.



The *contents* of the corpus as a rule is a description of the creative power of Yahweh and his gracious guidance of Israel in the past and present. This is an *enumeration* of his works, cf. 106,2. The Hebrew term for this is *spr*. Sometimes it has the character of a "confession", cf. 119, 76, 152; 135,5. In these descriptions of the work of Yahweh we often find much material of *common Oriental origin*, above all from the myths of the creation of the world, in these contexts often in a more original form, not so discoloured as in Gen. 1.

The *conclusion* of the hymn often takes the same form as the introduction. But it may also contain a *prayer* that Yahweh will graciously accept the poem (*dedication*, cf. 104,34), or an *intercession* for the congregation (33,22, cf. 48,15; 66,7), or a *curse* against enemies and a corresponding *benediction* of the "friends of Yahweh" (the concluding verse of the Song of Deborah).

The *place in the cult* occupied by the hymn we recognize e.g. in Amos 5,23 or in the cult descriptions of Chron. It accompanied the *sacrifice* (cf. the superscription of Ps. 100). 2 Sam. 6,5, cf. 1 Chron. 13,8, may indicate that hymns were sung in *processions*, cf. Ex. 32,18; Is. 30,9; Neh. 12,27-43. Important in this respect are the *accession hymns* which supply us with a picture of the New Year Festival. Certain *liturgies*, e.g. Ps. 24, are best understood when we assume such connections with a cultic procession.

These accession hymns are, as mentioned above, not special categories, but varieties of the hymn. The same is true of the so-called "*eschatological hymns*"<sup>1)</sup>. As a rule they are only a prophetic use of the style of the hymns aiming at vivifying the description of the impending time of glory; cf. the introductory phrase in Is. 12,1. - Is. 2,1ff., Micha 4,1ff., is a "Zion-hymn", used to describe the coming glory of Jerusalem - i.e. an "eschatologization" of hymns praising the sanctuary. If the introductory formula naming the end of the days is taken away we have left an ordinary, not eschatological, hymn on the sanctuary as it is believed to be in the cultic present tense of the ancient service. Others of these "eschatological hymns" are "accession hymns". This form is very frequent in *Deutero-Isaiah* who uses them in his description of the glorious future of Israel and the world to come.

In later Judaism we find the style of the hymns transferred to *human* objects, cf. 1 Macc. 3,3-9; 14,6-25<sup>2)</sup> and the great "Praise of the Fathers of Old". Ecclus 44ff.

*Literature:* My Indledning til Salmerne, pp. 123-25 and 126-137. Complete collection of all material of course in Gunkel's Einleitung in die Psalmen. - Cumming, The Accadian and Hebrew Hymns of Praise (1943), *Hymn*, pp. 23-27. Castellino, Le Lamentazioni e gli Inni in Babilonia e in Israele (1940), I have not seen.

<sup>1)</sup> Engnell is right in calling this term "an abuse of the word".

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 148.

When *Eissfeldt*, p. 120, from the introductory formula of Ps. 103,1 infers that we here have a *non-cultic*, individualistic use of the form of the hymn he overlooks that the psalm is a psalm of thanksgiving, with hymnic elements.

### The Psalms of Thanksgiving.

Both the "national" and "individual" psalms of thanksgiving are closely related to the hymn. The spirit of the hymn will always contain an element of thanksgiving for the great works of Yahweh. Correspondingly the forms are also related.

The *introductions* of psalms of thanksgiving are very much like some of the introductions of the hymns. Particularly characteristic are first lines as, "I exalt thee", or, "I praise thee", or, "My soul doth magnify the Lord".

The *corpus* generally contains the so-called "*confession*"<sup>1)</sup>, a "narrative" of the distress from which the people or the individual member of Israel or the king<sup>2)</sup> has been saved.

The *place in life* of these poems is the *sacrifice of thanksgiving*, cf. Jonah 2,10; Ps. 50,14; 107,22, cf. also 66,13-20; 116,17-19. This is found in Phoenician texts, e.g. in the inscription of *Yehaw-milk* 1,7-8<sup>3)</sup>, cf. also the description in Is. 38,9, and Job 33,19-40.

There are some differences in the description of the distress according to its character. If the danger has been caused by the *sins* of the subject of the psalm this is of course mentioned. This is called "*positive confession*", and the *grace of God* in forgiving the sin and saving the people or the individual speaking in the poem from the sufferings, regarded as punishment for the transgressions committed, is emphasized. On the other hand, if the misfortune has been caused, not by the sins of the psalmist, but by the wickedness of enemies, we find the so-called "*negative confession*": The prayer protests *innocence* and exalts the *justice of Yahweh* manifested in the liberation of the innocent from their distress. These two variations correspond to the two main forms of *psalms* of lamentation, viz. the *penitential* psalms and the psalms of *innocence*. *Engnell*<sup>4)</sup> rightly stresses that the description of the distress is often so elaborate and dominating that it can be difficult to determine if the psalm in question is a psalm of thanksgiving

<sup>1)</sup> cf. above, p. 152.

<sup>2)</sup> Setting aside the possibility that in a remote past all psalms belonged to the royal ritual, it is most probable that the "I" sometimes occurring in national psalms in connection with sections containing a "collective" subject signifies some person representing the community, i.e. the king, high priest etc. *Mowinkel*, *Offersang*, pp. 45f., 193f., underlines that in psalms of the congregation is the "I" older than "we", regarded from the viewpoint of history of style.

<sup>3)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 136. <sup>4)</sup> *Gamla testamentet* I, p. 56.

with a great description of distress, or a psalm of lamentation with anticipation of the thanksgiving. In connection with the description of distress we often find that the psalm of lamentation belonging to the day of trouble is repeated as part of the confession, cf. 30,9–11. Allusion is also made to the *vows* given in order to make Yahweh interfere to help (66,13–15; 116,14). – Combined with the confession elements of teaching resulting from the *experience* of Yahweh's help may appear. The psalms of thanksgiving are expressions of religious experience, of the gladdening assurance that prayers are heard by God. The psalmist wants to show his gratitude by leading others to share the same experiences when they are in need. This of course is especially characteristic of individual psalms. And in this place of the corpus the forms of *Wisdom literature* in some cases have got into the psalms and given rise to the theory of "didactic poems", cf. e.g. 32 and 73<sup>1)</sup>

The psalms of thanksgiving *conclude* like the hymn as a rule with a repetition of the tones of praise from the introduction. Both here and in the introduction the affinity between the two categories come to light when the psalm of thanksgiving takes up *hymnic* forms.

The forms of psalms of thanksgiving are sometimes freer and less conventional and sometimes exhibit examples of language which is not quite exquisite. *Mowinckel*<sup>2)</sup> has inferred from this that the psalms of thanksgiving in some cases have been composed not by the professional poets of the temples, but by the persons offering thanksgiving-sacrifices themselves as a sort of meritorious work. This seems to have parallels in Egyptian texts.

*Literature:* My Indledning til Salmerne, pp. 125ff, and *Gunkel*.

### The Psalms of Lamentation.

We have treated the psalms of thanksgiving directly after the hymns on account of the many formal affinities between the two categories. But we have already seen that in many respects they are perhaps more closely related to the psalms of lamentation and often difficult to distinguish from them. The psalms of lamentation are pre-suppositions of the thanksgiving-psalms: Distress precedes liberation.

Like the thanksgiving-psalms the lamentations can be either "collective" ("national") or "individual"<sup>3)</sup>. The *cultic situation* of the *national* psalms is the

<sup>1)</sup> cf. below, p. 161. *Engnell*, Gamla testamentet I, p. 57, cf. 64, thinks that Wisdom literature has its roots in the psalm literature, but cf. below p. 174.

<sup>2)</sup> Psalmenstudien VI, pp. 65–68.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. above p. 147.



*occasional penitential service* held to avert disasters which menace the nation or have already fallen upon it, e.g. defeat in war, siege, drought, grasshoppers, famine, pestilence etc. (1 Ki. 8,33-40; 21,9-12; Jer. 36,1-10; Joel 1,13-14; 2,12-17; Judith 4,9-15; 2 Sam. 24). But it is not impossible that an element of penitence has also been involved in the great *annual festivals*, already in pre-exilic days. *The Day of Atonement*, although in the present form described by a very late author, is materially an ancient institution, and its sin-offerings have of course been accompanied by songs of penitence. The *New Year Festival* may have contained an element of *ritual mourning*, related to the "weeping" of the fertility cults, but adapted to the special ideas of Israel, the New Year text of which (the Yahwistic narrative of the Creation and the Fall of Man) contains moments which might influence the ritual weeping of the people<sup>1</sup>). The idea of the *passion of the king*<sup>2</sup>), probably rather predominant in old time ritual, must also lead to the assumption that some penitential, both "national" and "individual" psalms, belong to the accession festival of Yahweh. In post-exilic days, when we get several fixed days of penitence and prayer in remembrance of the catastrophes which had befallen the nation (Zech. 7), the national psalms of lamentation were certainly sung. And again we must stress that the line of demarcation between "national" and "individual" psalms must not be drawn too mechanically. For there is a possibility that the original connexion of the psalms with the royal ritual must involve the conclusion that "individual" psalms, originally to be used by the king, on account of the position of the king as "incarnation" not only of God, but also of the nation, in reality are "national" psalms. In the present state, i.e. in historic Israel, the psalms may represent "disintegration" of the ritual and "democratization", so that they may be used by everyman, and so the "individual" psalms of course are used

<sup>1</sup>) I refer to the hints given in my book *Det sakrale kongedømme*, pp. 123ff., cf. also pp. 111ff., and other places. For the ritual "weeping" I especially refer to the book of my colleague *Hvidberg*, *Graad og Latter i det gamle Testamente* (1938). In my paper on the story of the Ark in Sam., in *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* 1948, I have made some further hints.

<sup>2</sup>) In this respect, too, I must restrict myself to a reference to *Det sakrale kongedømme*, *passim*, with a reserve which I do not want to diminish. On the contrary I must call the words of *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet* I, p. 57: that the cultic situation of the *individual* psalms is the different sorts of *ordalia*, oracles, expiatory rites, and sacrifices for sin, a description not quite exact. For, in the first place, the same may be said of the *collective* psalms too. But, secondly, from the premises of *Engnell*, it ought to be stressed that the rites mentioned are not only the casual rites, but also those belonging to the festivals of the calendar. In this case *Engnell* could rightly have said some polemic words against a sentence in the Danish edition of the present work, now omitted, which I suspect has been taken over rather mechanically into *Engnell's* own book.

especially in cases where "Everyman" needs purification and remission of his sins etc.

Like the hymns, the psalms of lamentation have a "*primitive cell*" in a *cultic exclamation*, probably the "*ḥomēnī Yahweh*" (51,3; 57,2; 86,3, cf. Lk. 18,13), and probably the category has been called *ṭḥinnā*<sup>1)</sup>, cf. the superscription of Ps. 102.

The psalms of lamentation have been very much imitated by the prophets, especially *Jeremiah*, cf. Is. 50,4; 59,12-14; 64,5-7, cf. also 26,10-13; 33,7-9; Hab 1,12-17. The Jeremianic lamentations are found in the chapters 11-20.

The introduction generally consists of an *invocation*. Frequently this is limited to the pronunciation of the *divine name*. To the invocation is generally added a *prayer*, that Yahweh will hear, or it may be a cry for help or a reproachful question (c.g. the well-known first words of Ps. 22), or a supplication to God not to make his punishment too severe (Ps. 6 and 38). The invocation may be enlarged by different *epitheta ornantia* giving the introduction a more or less *hymnic* form. It may even happen that the whole introduction is a hymn of not quite small dimensions, as in the national lamentation Ps. 89. Then the psalm assumes the character of a *liturgy* or *cantata*<sup>2)</sup>. In other poems a psalm expressing *confidence* in Yahweh is placed at the head of the composition (9,1-9; 21,1-8; 27,1-6). Introductory psalms of the latter kind are also found as independent poems and are then by some scholars called "*psalms of confidence*"<sup>3)</sup> (c.g. Ps. 23). This again is an example of the breaking of the scheme of classification by introducing aspects of contents instead of the usual formal criteria. The psalms of confidence are in reality the "motives of confidence" from the corpus of the lamentations<sup>4)</sup> developed into independent psalms.

The lamentation *addresses* God, it does not speak of him, as in the case of the hymn.

In the corpus different "*motives*" alternate. The word "*motives*" is here used in the special meaning of attempts to *move* Yahweh, to make him intervene in the plight of the psalmist. The motives are to a great extent the same in national and individual psalms. Most frequently the psalm appeals to Yahweh's *pity* for the sufferer by painting his state in the darkest colours. This is called the "*description of distress*". He is near his death, already in the mouth and teeth

<sup>1)</sup> Gunkel, *Einleitung in die Ps.*, pp. 258ff., with enumeration of other termini, cf. *Hymnō*, p. 27. — Engnell, p. 57, in this case (cf. p. 149, n. 2) also allows himself the evolutionistic use of words not going well with his "anti-evolutionistic" state of mind.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. below, p. 161f.

<sup>3)</sup> Engnell, p. 57. Gunkel: "*Vertrauenspsalm*"; Mowinkel, *Offersang*, pp. 221f.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. below.



of *Sheol*, drowning in the waters of the underworld. *Chaos* is overwhelming him. In this situation he remembers Yahweh as a help in ages past, but we also hear *reproaches* because Yahweh does not act in the same way in the actual situation: He is sitting idle, letting the sufferer down (22,5-7; 44,1-10; 74,12ff.); or the prayer points out that Yahweh's actions or his inactivity do not correspond to his words and promises to the chosen people or the royal house (cf. 89,19ff., cf. the stress laid upon the promises to David in the beginning of the composition). Individual psalms also appeal to the memorable stories of the salvation experienced by the people, the "gospel" of the accession festival of Yahweh as the ruler of the world and the judge of men and nations being remembered in the distress of the individual<sup>1</sup>). But here again the original connection with the *royal ritual* and the consequent inherent element of "nationality" in "individual" poems must be taken into account.

In contexts of this kind we also find the "*motives of confidence*" already referred to. They appeal to Yahweh, telling him that the sufferer is utterly dependent on Him, and that he must not let him down. Accordingly these motives, when developed into independent psalms, are in reality prayers for deliverance from evil. In characterizing Pss. 23 and 131 as psalms of thanksgiving<sup>2</sup>), therefore, I am not fully justified<sup>3</sup>). But there is truth in the assertion that the "psalm of confidence" of course contains an element of gratitude and may be used as an expression of this mood. But at least originally they are not of this kind. They are expressions of the courage and the confidence in God which is felt by the sufferer when he completely surrenders himself to God, expecting help only from Him. Ps. 131 is the most beautiful expression of this situation. That psalms of confidence in reality are prayers for help is seen from compositions like Pss. 27 and 125.

Another motive appeals to Yahweh's *honour*. When Israel or the individual Israelite perishes or becomes a laughing stock to the enemies and a theme for the poets of taunting songs (cf. 44,14-17; 69,12) Yahweh himself is dishonoured (42,11). It is also argued that Yahweh loses the praise of the sufferer if he allows him to be lost in *Sheol*, for the dead cannot praise God (6,6; 31,10; 88,11ff.; 115,17; Is. 38,18-19).

The complaint of the sufferer also in the corpus of the poem often uses the reproachful question (cf. above). Characteristic is the phrase "How long..." (*'ad mātaj*, or *'ad 'anā*) which also has Babylonian equivalents<sup>4</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. my commentary on Ps. 7,8 and Ps. 9-10 (pp. 43 and 110).

<sup>2</sup>) Indledning til de gtl. Salmer, p. 126.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. my commentary.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. my Indledning til de gtl. Salmer, p. 139, n. 1.



To the complaints are added *vows*. In OT poetry the vow most frequently promises the intention of the sufferer to praise Yahweh, his power and glory, to the congregation, "in the great congregation", nay, to all men, all the world. The concluding verses of Ps. 22 in this connection speak of *the dead*<sup>1)</sup>. The vow, then, means that the sufferer will sing a song of thanksgiving<sup>2)</sup>. This song may even be anticipated at the end of the lament, in some cases in so elaborate a form that scholars have thought it to be an originally separate, independent poem. But this assumption – e.g. in the case of the second half of Ps. 22 – is not necessary. – In the secondary conclusion of Ps. 51, and in other passages, e.g. in the description of the great sacrificial meal in Ps. 22, the vow promises a thanksgiving-*sacrifice*. In the original part of Ps. 51 this is transformed. The psalmist says that because he knows that Yahweh does not want animal sacrifice he will promise to sacrifice himself, his "broken spirit", his "broken and contrite heart" (v. 19); and his vow promises that after the new creation of his personality from which he expects a new life he will bring sinners like himself to conversion through his confession (v. 15–17).

We have noted the difference between *two kinds of lamentation*<sup>3)</sup>: The "psalms of innocence" and those of *penitence*, with their "negative" and "positive" confession. The former class has to a great extent been interpreted as "*prayers of the accused*" by Hans Schmidt. Their cultic situation is described in 1 Ki. 8,31–32, cf. Deut. 17,8; Ex. 22,6ff.; Num. 5,11ff.; and Deut. 21,1–8<sup>4)</sup>. A special characteristic of these prayers is the reminiscence of the "*oath of purification*" (Ps. 7,4).

The lamentations very often *conclude* by expressing *certainty of the prayer being granted*. The transition from wailing despair to this confident certainty is often so abrupt that critics of the older school assumed a secondary addition in the end of the poems. More recently it has been assumed that in cultic use the gap has been filled by an *oracle* giving the divine answer to the prayer. This supposed oracle is found in prophetic imitations of the lamentations, e.g. Hos. 14,5–9; Jer. 4,1–2; 14,10; 15,1–4; 11,21–23; 12,5–6; 15,19–20; Is. 50,10–11; 51,12–16, and in several other places. In some passages of the prophetic books it has the shape of a certainty that the prayer has *not* been granted – a strong evidence of the reality of the religious life which expresses

<sup>1)</sup> cf. my commentary, and Det sakrale kongedömmet, p. 139, n. 1.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. above.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. p. 152.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. Det sakrale kongedömmet, pp. 47f. and 107, where I have stated my reasons for sticking to this theory.

itself in these ancient forms. And as we have a type of *cultic oracles* preserved in the Psalter (12,5; 14; 20,7; 27,8; 81,7; 85,9; 91,3; 121) it may be considered a confirmation of the hypothesis that the oracle – which was of course not an integral part of the text of the psalms – is lacking elsewhere. Ps. 60,8ff. we possess the oracle in a national lamentation from very ancient times.

*Literature:* My Indledning til de gtl. Salmer, pp. 137–140 and the corresponding § by Gunkel. Hans Schmidt, Das Gebet der Angeklagten im AT (1928), in BeihZATW, also – in shorter form – Old Testament Essays, Papers read before the Society for Old Testament Study (1927), pp. 143ff. Küchler, in the Festschrift für Baudissin (1918), p. 295 (on the *oracle* in psalms of lamentation). Baumgartner, Die Klagegedichte des Jeremia (1917). Mowinkel, in “Edda” 1925: Motiver og stilformer i Jeremias digtning (pp. 277ff.): cf. my Indledning til de gtl. Sl., p. 152f.

Concerning the relations between the Israelite material and the wider Oriental circle the important work of Widengren, The Accadian and Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation as Religious Documents (1936) must be consulted. Stummer, Sumerisch-Akkadische Parallelen zum Aufbau alttestamentlicher Psalmen (1922).—Zu Christoph Barth, Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage- und Dankliedern des AT's (1947), vgl. Kapelrud, in Svensk Exeg. Årsbok 1948, pp. 56ff.

“Foreign types”. Liturgies. Mixture of types.

By “foreign types” is here not understood “outlandish types”. The types of Israelite–Jewish religious poetry are common to the entire Ancient Orient. But by this expression we describe poetry belonging to other spheres of literature, but used in the Psalms<sup>1</sup>).

The form of *oracles* for instance plays a great part in the Psalter<sup>2</sup>). Some pieces seem to be akin to priestly oracles<sup>3</sup>). Hylmø<sup>4</sup>) rightly considers “*liturgical tōrōt*” like Ps. 15 and the corresponding parts of Ps. 24, announcing the claims to be fulfilled by those seeking access to the sanctuary, to be of this class. In the same way Ps. 132 notifies the divine claims to the Davidic dynasty to be fulfilled if it wants the favour of Yahweh. As the explanation of parts of Ps. 20 or 85 we must assume that a voice is here proclaiming a word of God as the answer to prayers, probably the voice of a *cult–prophet* or *priest*<sup>5</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. Engnell, Gamla testamentet I, p. 61, who speaks of “extraordinary elements of special origin, e.g. cult–prophetic or priestly oracles”.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. above, p. 158.

<sup>3</sup>) below, pp. 185ff.

<sup>4</sup>) p. 37.

<sup>5</sup>) Haldar, Associations of Cult Prophets (1945), has shown that priest and cult–prophet were to a great extent related. The relation has been pointed out already by Mowinkel, Psalmenstudien III, and by Johnson, The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel (1944). Haldar's one-sidedness is pointed out by Rowley, The Unity of the OT (Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol. 29, No. 2, Febr. 1946, p. 8).

From these temple circles, and related to oracles, are also *formulas of benediction and curse* as Ps. 128 or 134,3 or the benedictions of the patriarchs<sup>1)</sup>, and also – with Wisdom literature as intermediate link – the combination of blessings and curses like Ps. 1 and 112.

In some of these oracles it is perhaps not priests, but cult-prophets who are speaking. The line of demarcation between priests and cult-prophets is difficult to determine<sup>2)</sup>. As examples of the kind of poetry emanating from these circles we mention Ps. 50, perhaps also Ps. 81, already named, and Ps. 95, which is very much alike to Ps. 81. Their exhortations to obedience to the commands of God have, e.g. in Ps. 78 and 106, developed into long versified severe lectures. To the same category belongs perhaps the *Song of Moses*, Deut. 32. Versified penitential addresses of this kind are again presuppositions for *prose sermons*, just as ordinary psalms are prototypes of the prose prayers, or as the cult-prophetic oracles of Ps. 2 or 110 are reproduced in prose in Nathan's speech to David in 2 Sam. 7. Sermons of this kind we find above all in the *parenetic sections of Deuteronomy*<sup>3)</sup> and similar passages of Deuteronomic or Aaronite<sup>4)</sup> kind in the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel<sup>5)</sup>. The exhortative and penitential sermon of cultic prophets is upon the whole an important presupposition for the speeches of the prophets. Original parenetic oracles like Ps. 95 and 81 and 50 were probably joined to *rites* by which the covenant between Yahweh and Israel was renewed. In their present form they are parts of *liturgies* for this ceremony. Others, e.g. Ps. 20, belong to the service before a war.

In connection with the influence of the oracle – and herewith we do not think of influence from the wrongly so-called “literary prophets”, but cultic oracles<sup>5)</sup> – upon the poetry of the psalms we must above all point to the *oracles to the king*. We have mentioned Ps. 20 where it is not easy to say if a priest or a cult-prophet is speaking. But pieces like Ps. 2 or 110 are – by expressive formulas (2,7; 110,1) – clearly defined as “prophetic”, cf. the introduction of Ps. 45 describing the state of inspiration. Ps. 72 exhibits the form of benediction. To the same category belongs the prose rendering of Nathan's oracle

1) cf. above, p. 143.

2) cf. p. 159, n. 5.

3) cf. my *Die Josianische Reform* (1926), pp. 96–102 and 104.

4) This word is used by me as a designation of the literature related to Ezekiel and the Priestly source, cf. part II.

5) Engnell, *Gamla testamentet* I, p. 62, n. 1. is quite right in underlining the difference over against the older critical school. The great prophets are not prior to the psalms, but the psalms are prior to the great prophets. And, besides the psalms, the forms inherited from cultic (priestly) prophets have framed the style of the great prophets.



to David, 2 Sam. 7,7-17, in its original form dating from the time of David<sup>1</sup>). The type has as its *cultic situation* the king's accession to the throne at the New Year festival.

Besides the influence of priestly and prophetic categories we have to point out that the *Wisdom literature* has made its influence felt. Taken de rigueur the pure type of Wisdom literature is only found in the Psalter in Ps. 1 and 112 and 127. Ps. 119 is no "*didactic poem*", but a sort of psalm of lamentation, comprising a multitude of types of poetry<sup>2</sup>). The theory of "*didactic poems*" in the Psalter has – as Mowinckel has pointed out – often been exaggerated<sup>3</sup>). A *didactic tendency* appears in the psalms of lamentation in the section containing the vow<sup>4</sup>). But even psalms contemplating the problem of retribution are not "*didactic*" just because they are treating this theme. Ps. 73 e.g. is a psalm of thanksgiving, Ps. 25 a lamentation; 37 speaks the language of gratitude. Ps. 49 is most probably – according to determination by means of examination of contents, not of form – what was called a "*psalm of confidence*"<sup>5</sup>), but its bard-like introduction reminds us of the "*didactic section*" of the psalms of thanksgiving and is therefore to be recognized as a specimen of this kind. Ps. 32 is also a psalm of thanksgiving, like Ps. 49 a fulfilment of the vow, known from Ps. 51, that the sufferer promises to teach sinners to find their way back to God<sup>6</sup>).

Earlier in this paragraph we have pointed out that prophetic or priestly oracles may appear as part of compositions, e.g. as answer to prayer in the psalms of lamentation, and that e.g. prophetic parenetic speeches like Ps. 50 etc. probably belonged to rites of the renewal of the covenant. A liturgical *tōrā* is e.g. part of a processional composition in Ps. 24, and the parenetic sections in Ps. 81 and 95 are preceded by hymns. These compositions we call "*liturgies*". It is assumed that certain complex pieces of poetry, in which different types are combined and which seem to have the character of antiphonal songs, are best explained as compositions arranged for a complicated cultic situation with alternating rites<sup>7</sup>). Examples of such poems are Ps. 24,

<sup>1</sup>) Noth, *Die Gesetze im Pentateuch* (1940), p. 12; Mowinckel, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1947, p. 224.

<sup>2</sup>) I refer to Gunkel's analysis of the style of psalm in his commentary.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. my *Indledning til de gtl. Salmer*, p. 145.

<sup>4</sup>) above, p. 154.

<sup>5</sup>) above, p. 157.

<sup>6</sup>) Concerning Engnell's theory of the origin of the Wisdom literature from cultic circles, cf. below, p. 174f.

<sup>7</sup>) I have here taken over Engnell's description (*Gamla testamentet* I, p. 61) instead of that given in the Danish edition of the present work.

89, 132, or 118. The change of mood in such psalms has often been used as proof that they were not originally homogenous compositions. The truth of this assumption is that they consist of sections of different styles, looking like independent poems. But the form-critical investigations lead to the assumption that the change of style is accounted for by the progress of the ritual. On closer inspection it is often possible to form a picture of a ritual situation in which the different parts correspond to one another as different links of a service. Thus Ps. 24 is a ritual enacted on the arrival of a procession at the temple-gates, and likewise Ps. 118. That Ps. 132 has this character has often been assumed. In such "*liturgies*" the different types stand side by side, each of them, however, in their right place in life. The liturgy can assume a more hymnic character when it belongs to a festival of rejoicing, and be more plaintive on a day of penitence, even if also in the latter situation the hymnic elements can have their appropriate places expressing the appeals to Yahweh's honour or to his loyalty to his promises. Liturgies of this kind are sometimes imitated by the prophets (cf. Jer. 14; Micah 7; Is. 33; Hab. et al.)<sup>1)</sup>. A great liturgy, very similar to that of Ps. 89, is found in Is. 63, 7-65, 19<sup>2)</sup>.

Liturgies (*combination* of types) must not be confounded with "*mixture* of types". This latter phenomenon does not, e.g., explain the cases where an oracle appears as part of a psalm. That is a liturgy. In the liturgies the types stand side by side filling their proper place in the cult as links of the ritual to which they belong. *Mixture of types* means e.g. that Wisdom literature transforms the whole of a psalm of lamentation, or one of its "motives", especially the section containing the vow of the sufferer, or the whole of a thanksgiving, or only its confession, or that the introduction of a psalm of lamentation takes on a hymnic character, or the vow-section is expanded so that the promised psalm of thanksgiving is anticipated. Such phenomena are especially characteristic of the *prose-prayers* of later ages, where all elements are mixed, and where themes from "foreign types" are incorporated, not only genuine elements of the psalms, but also those of the sermon, nay, even the casuistry of the style of laws<sup>3)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> In Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 1945, Engnell in his article on the Servant Songs in Is. 40ff. takes up the idea of Gyllenberg, *ibid.* 1940, p. 47, that Deutero-Isaiah is a prophetic imitation of a collection of liturgies to the New Year Festival. This idea deserves a closer examination.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. my commentary.

<sup>3)</sup> comp. below, p. 209.



### The types of the psalms outside their place in life.

When the historical books, frequently in a somewhat mechanical manner, have psalms incorporated in their narrative, it cannot be described as a real imitation of the style of the psalms. Here psalms often appear outside their original place in the cult, presumably because the writer who incorporated them no longer understood their meaning. Thus it is misplaced when a redactor introduces a royal psalm as a psalm of thanksgiving in 1 Sam. 2<sup>1</sup>), or when another makes Jonah sing a psalm of thanksgiving in the belly of the sea-monster *before* his salvation. On the other hand, the short hymn Ex. 15,20 is probably placed in a very appropriate situation (cf. Ps. 68,26) by the Elohist narrator, even if it appears to be more natural to assume that this localisation is the result of "historical", not cultic, considerations. The more elaborate form in 15,1-18 has at any rate been composed after the immigration in Palestine (cf. v. 13-18). Both forms are hymns to the accession festival of Yahweh and probably belong to this festival as it was celebrated at the temple of Jerusalem. But the main subject of this festival was the crossing of the Red Sea, and this has naturally led the narrator to combine the psalm with his story<sup>2</sup>).

In such cases, then, we have not imitation of the style of psalms before us, but real psalms, which – sometimes rightly, sometimes wrongly – have been connected with the narratives, just as the older songs of Balaam have been incorporated in the frame of the Yahwistic narrative, not – like the younger Balaam-songs – composed for the framework.

*Real imitation*, on the other hand, occurs largely in the *prophetic books*. It is very natural for the prophets to use the form of liturgies in which an oracle constitutes an integral part (cf. above, p. 161). Likewise they were easily led to imitate the liturgical *tōrā*<sup>3</sup>) when they wanted to teach the people

<sup>1</sup>) I have left this sentence in its original form because I want to wait for the more thorough examination which is necessary to make good the assertion of Engnell (Gamla testamentet I, p. 62f.): that the Song of Hannah is not incorporated in the narrative of 1 Sam. 2, but is in reality the nucleus round which the narrative has been formed.

<sup>2</sup>) Here, it seems easier to understand an original connexion of the kind assumed by Engnell in the case of the Song of Hannah. The different strands in the narrative Ex. 1-15 probably are *epic* narratives, founded on the Passover ritual, as Pedersen has attempted to show. Concerning the literary character of the narrative, comp. my notes in Det sakrale kongedömmet, pp. 14ff. I do not think it necessary to give up the separation of strata in the story, even if the theory of the Passover-myth is accepted. Concerning the use of the word "*strata*" I refer to vol. II.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. pp. 188ff.



the commandments of God. Liturgical *tôrôt* of this kind we find e.g. in Is. 1,10-17 and Micah 6,6-8. In the latter passage not only the answer of the prophet, but also the question of the people has been incorporated in the liturgy composed by the prophet.

But also other types have been taken over by the prophets. We have mentioned their imitations of – externally – more “secular” types<sup>1)</sup>. *Jeremiah* has especially cultivated the style of the psalm of lamentation. He composes national lamentations and so identifies himself with his people in its distress: In ch. 14,1-15,3 he develops a great liturgy for a day of penitence, culminating in a transformation of the frequent conclusion in psalms of lamentation. The usual conviction that the prayer has been granted has here been replaced by the certainty that Yahweh refuses to fulfil the prayer. The prophet tries to lead the people off into the psalm of penitence (3,22-25; 14,7ff.; 14,20ff.; cf. Hos. 5,15-6,3): This is a direct exhortation to penitence. In his descriptions of the disasters he is often dependent upon the imagery which the national psalms of lamentation use to describe disaster and distress (4,20-21; 4,29; 6,24; 8,18). But most characteristic is his use of the *individual* psalm of lamentation to express his own experiences and his own feelings, his compassion for the people, but also his sufferings under the pain imposed upon him by his very vocation as a prophet (many of the poetical pieces in 11-20).

Similar imitations of the style of psalms are found e.g. in Is. 63,7-65,19<sup>2)</sup>. Other “prophetic liturgies” we have found in Is. 33 and Micah 7,7ff., and in the liturgical parts of *Hab.* and *Joel*.

*Deutero-Isaiah* too composes liturgies and psalms. Especially the hymns for the accession festival of Yahweh have influenced his style, and in the *Songs of the Servant of Yahweh* the style of psalms of lamentation appears (e.g. 50,4ff.; 51,9-16<sup>3)</sup>). In the most famous of them, the liturgy of the vicarious passion of the Servant of God (52,13-53,12), we find elements of the psalm of penitence (as expression of the confession of the wrong judgment of the onlookers concerning the Servant) in a strange combination with a paradoxical transformation of the style of the funeral dirge<sup>4)</sup>.

In other passages of the OT, too, the influence of the style of psalms can be noticed. Thus the speeches of *Job* are clearly marked by the form of psalms of lamentation, while the hymn, also in the form of “auto-louange” (cf. p. 151),

<sup>1)</sup> cf. pp. 126ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 162.

<sup>3)</sup> I count – in disagreement with most commentators – this passage among the servant-sections, for reasons given in my commentary.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. p. 138.

makes itself felt in the speeches of God in Job 38ff. and in Prov. 8, Sir. 24, and in Deutero-Isaiah<sup>1)</sup>.

Imitation of the psalms and of cultic poetry upon the whole is also to be noticed in the *prayers of later prose-literature*, e.g. the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple, 1 Ki. 8, the confessions of sin in Ezra 9 and Neh. 9, the prayer of penitence in Dan. 9, and its parallels in the Apocrypha (esp. Baruch). The speech of Nathan to David in 2 Sam. 7 is a prose rendering of an oracle to the king at his enthronement<sup>2)</sup>. The *Deuteronomistic sermons* have much in common with the parenetic oracles of the psalms (50, 78, 81, 95, 106-107). The two last examples, the speech of Nathan and the sermons are, however, not renderings of genuine forms of psalms, but of forms originating in the oracular style.<sup>3)</sup>

*Literature:* My Indledning til de gtl. Salmer, ch. XIII and literature quoted there. – On the “I” in the psalms: Smend, in ZATW 1888; Balla, Das Ich der Psalmen (1912); Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien V, p. 35; Åke V. Ström, Vetekornet (1944), pp. 115ff.

### Cultic poetry or non-cultic lyrics?

In the preceding paragraphs on the Psalms we have throughout presupposed the conception lying at the base of Mowinckel's Psalmenstudien, that the Psalms, as they stand now, are most cases *genuine cult poems*, not, as Gunkel supposes, mostly *imitations* of cult poems.<sup>4)</sup> No real arguments can be produced for the theory of Gunkel, with the exception of the very precarious idea that poems such as Ps. 39, 51, 130 are so “personal and of so profoundly religious contents that it should be artificial to presume that they have been composed as texts accompanying cultic acts<sup>5)</sup>” – as if it were impossible that cultic texts can be profoundly religious! Likewise, it is not easy to understand why the *alphabetic form* in a psalm would make the cultic use improbable. We get the impression that in one case the psalms are too deep, in the other too shallow to belong to cultic poetry. Eissfeldt<sup>6)</sup> also concedes that a really thoroughgoing proof of the existence of religious poetry detached from the cult, called a “spiritual” poetry, cannot be established. Not until the times

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 151.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 160f.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. pp. 183ff.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. also Eissfeldt, pp. 130ff., on the individual psalms of lamentation.

<sup>5)</sup> Eissfeldt, p. 133.

<sup>6)</sup> loc. cit.

of later Judaism are we able to speak of a "place in life" for poetry in the style of psalms outside the temple cult. In the *schools of the Wise* in those days a poetry in the old forms comes into existence, but strongly marked by its place of origin, the Wisdom literature now breaking into the style of Psalms in overwhelming strength. As examples we refer to the *Psalms of Solomon*, the *Prayer of Manasseh*, a series of texts in Sir. (14,20-15,8; 16,24-18,14; 24; 33,1-13a+36, 16b-22; 39,12-35; 42,15-43,33; 44,1-50,24; 51,1-12), in *Wisdom* (1,1ff. and 9,1-8), the prayers in *Daniel* 2,20-23 and 9,4-19, in the *Syriac Baruch*, 48 and 54; 1 Macc. 3,50-53 and 4,30, 33; *Baruch*; prayers in 2 and 3 Macc. (2 Macc. 15,22-24; 1,24-29; 3 Macc. 2,20; 6,2-15); the apocryphal poems in Dan. 3<sup>1)</sup> and in the additions to *Esther*, *Judith* (9,2-14; 16,1-17), *Tobit* (3,2-6; 3,11-15; 8,5-7; 13,2ff.). A great deal of the material consists of *prose prayers* preserving the pattern of the psalms, like corresponding prose prayers in the Canon. Psalms of this kind belong to devotional meetings in the temple-university and the schools of the Wise, and from this milieu originate psalms of a didactic-devotional kind.

*Literature:* Mowinkel, Kirke og Folk (1934). Ludin Jansen, Die spätjüdische Psalmen-dichtung (1937), and Mowinkel's review in Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift 1938, pp. 236ff. Weiser, Theophanie in den Ps. und im Festkult (Bertholet-Festschr., pp. 513ff.).

#### Poets and collections of poems.

Of the *poets* who have composed the psalms we do not know much. The *traditional* information is uncertain. Most of the names given by tradition (The Sons of Korah, Asaph, Ethan, Heman) apparently lead to the assumption that the poems originate from certain *families*, e.g. the Judaic house of Ezrahites (i Chron. 2,6; 1 Ki. 5,11), and the family of the *Korahites* who like the Ezrahites are not originally "Levites"<sup>2)</sup>. Presumably we must accept the theory that the authors of the psalms are that class of temple servants called the "*singers*" (*mēšorārim*), in later times reckoned among the "Levites" (Neh. 11,17; 12,23 and Chron.), but shortly before (Ezra 2,41) mentioned as a special class of temple functionaries. This class probably originated in *pre-exilic* times. We have evidence of "singers", both male and female (Ez. 8,14; cf. the description of Hezekiah's tribute to Sennacherib in the text of the *Taylor-cylinder*; Ps. 68,26 etc.). There was certainly a connection between the singers and the *temple prophets* (2 Chron. 25,1-3; 35,15)<sup>3)</sup>.

In circles of this kind the *minor collections* of the Psalter have their origin<sup>4)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> especially concerning these poems: Kuhl, Die drei Männer im Feuer (1930).

<sup>2)</sup> cf. Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie, pp. 58f. and 63. "Ezrahites" means "natives", i.e. probably "Canaanites" (Mowinkel, Offersang, p. 343, n. 16.).

<sup>3)</sup> cf. above, p. 159, n. 5. <sup>4)</sup> cf. vol. II.



The tradition of *David* as composer of psalms has had special importance leading to the tendency to attribute more and more poems to him, as is illustrated e.g. by the increase in the number of Davidic psalms in the Greek translation. Beside the other collections there must have existed an anthology called the "Prayers of David the son of Jesse" (Ps. 72,20). This indication of authorship cannot be understood otherwise than the analogous superscriptions referring the psalms to the authors previously mentioned. It must mean "psalms belonging to the anthology of the guild of singers naming themselves after David". In the context of the Book of Psalms *l'dāwīd* is an indication of authorship, which means that like other heroes of the past, especially the patriarchs and Moses, David was considered a poet, i.e. a man capable of uttering effective words. The psalms that bore his name would be of great use to those who sought the temple to benefit by its cultic practice<sup>1</sup>). But the discoveries at *Mari* have shown that *dāwīd* is also a *title* of a king or chief. In Israel the expression *l'dāwīd* may originally have been a description of the psalms as belonging to the royal ritual, meaning "for the use of David"<sup>2</sup>). The expression has *two* roots, a) the idea of David as patriarch of temple singers, and b) his position as patriarch of the Jerusalem royal house as "the *dāwīdum* par excellence. A pre-Israelite use of the word is supposed by Engnell.

*Literature:* See the survey of Johnson, in *The OT and Modern Study*, ed. by Rowley (1951).

### *The Wisdom Literature.*

#### Popular Proverbs.

The literary unit which is characteristic of the so-called Wisdom literature of the OT and of the ancient world as a whole is the "*sentence*" or "*proverb*". Generally the "*sentence*" consists of one single Hebrew "*verse*", built according to the rules of *parallelism*. It is generally assumed that it has some relation to the *popular proverb*.

Both kinds, "*sentences*" and "*popular proverbs*", are called in Hebrew *mašāl*. This word is however also used of other kinds of literature, e.g. the *taunting song* (Is. 14,4ff.; Micah 2,4; Ez. 12,22ff; 18,2f.; cf. also Ps. 22,15; Jer. 24,9; 2 Chron. 7,20; Deut. 28,37; 1 Ki. 9,7 Ps. 69,12) and the *words of seers and poets* (e.g. in the story of *Balaam*, cf. Ps. 49,5; 78,2; Job 27,1; 29,1). The corresponding *verb* too in its different forms shows that the word has a wider meaning than our "*proverb*".

<sup>1</sup>) My Indledning til de gtl. Salmer, pp. 57-61; Det sakrale kongedømme, pp. 39f., 49ff., esp. p. 57.

<sup>2</sup>) Mowinkel, Psalmenstudien VI, p. 71, cf. Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship*, p. 176f.; see also II, p. 169, n. 5.—cf. Appendix to vol. II, p. 169.

Several explanations have been advanced. The word has been combined with the meaning "to be *similar*", "to be *equal*". On this basis Eissfeldt<sup>1)</sup> started his suggestion that the word designates a *comparison*. But the meaning "*similitude*" (Ez. 17,2; 21,5, 24,3) will not suit all passages where the word occurs, and most of the popular proverbs of the OT are not comparisons. The corresponding phenomenon among the *Arabs*, described by a word of the same root as the Hebrew<sup>2)</sup>, speaks against this explanation.

An understanding has also been attempted from the point of view of "*sympathetic magic*"<sup>3)</sup>, on the assumption that the meaning of the root is "to be similar". But the best explanation is certainly offered by Boström<sup>4)</sup>, based on hints given by Johs. Pedersen, starting from the meaning of the root "to rule". The noun then signifies a sentence spoken by "rulers", filled with the power of mighty souls. In similar manner Hylmö<sup>5)</sup> speaks of a "winged word", outliving the fleeting moment.

Like all nations, Israel has had its *popular proverbs*. Some of them have been handed down in the OT (1 Sam. 10, 12, cf. 19, 24; 1 Sam. 24, 14; cf. Ez. 16, 44; Gen. 10, 9; 2 Sam. 5, 8, <sup>6)</sup> Job 2, 4<sup>7)</sup>; 1 Ki. 20, 11; Jer. 23, 28; 31, 29, cf. Ez 18, 2; Is 5, 19; Zeph. 1, 12; Ez. 12, 22; cf. from the NT Lk. 4, 23). On probable popular sayings preserved in the Book of Proverbs something will be said later.

Hylmö<sup>8)</sup> rightly draws attention to the circumstance that – setting aside a few of the proverbs preserved in the books of the prophets – *the popular proverbs have no poetical form*, neither parallelism nor rhythm, and most of them have no religious character<sup>9)</sup>. It is however worth noticing that one proverb in this respect is ambiguous. The word on Saul and the prophets in 1 Sam. 10 is explained from a rather contemptuous view concerning prophets, in 1 Sam. 19, on the other hand, it is expression of great esteem.

After all, however, it is evident that the form of popular proverbs cannot be regarded, at least not directly, as the origin of the *Wisdom poetry*, which

<sup>1)</sup> Eissfeldt, *Der Maschal im AT* (1913); cf. Wheeler Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation in the OT*, p. 233.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. Gesenius-Buhl's dictionary.

<sup>3)</sup> A. H. Godbey, in *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 1923, pp. 89ff.

<sup>4)</sup> Paronomasi i den äldre hebreiska maschallitteraturen (1928), cf. Johs. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten* (1914), p. 12.

<sup>5)</sup> p. 40.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. the commentary of Budde.

<sup>7)</sup> Lindblom, *Boken om Job* (1940), p. 56.

<sup>8)</sup> p. 42.

<sup>9)</sup> so also Engnell, *Gamla testamentet I*, p. 63.

makes use of the form of "sentences". At any rate we may say that the art of poetry has, to a high degree, altered the original popular proverb in respect of its form.

### The "Sentence" and its place in life.

The Wisdom "sentence" is not popular poetry. It is a *work of art*. But perhaps we may assume that the collections have preserved some popular proverbs. Eissfeldt<sup>1)</sup> points to Prov. 10,6, cf. 10,11; 10,15, cf. 18,11, 11,14, cf. 20,19, calling attention to their *prosaic* form.

Like other Israelite poetry, e.g. the literature of the psalms, Wisdom literature is no specifically Israelite phenomenon. It is *international*. Both in *Mesopotamia* and on the banks of the *Nile* it was cultivated. The OT is well aware of the fact that Wisdom literature has roots in foreign countries and peoples. In 1 Ki. 5,11<sup>2)</sup> we are told that "Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the East Country, and all the wisdom of Egypt". *Job* and his friends are described as "children of the East Country". *Agur* and *Lemuel* (Prov. 30,1ff.; 31,1ff.) are Arabs, cf. Gen. 25,14. — Jer. 49,7 and Ob. 8 speak of the Wisdom of the Edomites. 1 Ki. 5,11f. also mention some ancient, now unknown sages *Ethan*, *Heman*, *Chalcol*, and *Darda*, the sons of *Mahol*. Of these the first two are otherwise remembered as authors of psalms, while the other two are only found here. That they are Israelites cannot be established as fact.<sup>3)</sup> The *Book of Proverbs* exhibits many parallels to foreign, especially Egyptian, Wisdom literature, and 22,17ff. is manifestly an adaptation of the Egyptian Book of *Amenemope*. Also the *Aramaic*, but perhaps originally *Assyrian*, *Story of Ahikar* contains many Wisdom sentences parallel to the OT.

Solomon's predominant place in the traditions of Israel's Wisdom is due to the fact that during his time Israel was opened to the surrounding world in a manner which gave the circles cultivating this literature importance for the public life of Israel. From later times the interest of King *Hezekiah* is known (Prov. 25,1). But Israelite Wisdom literature, like most OT literature, is generally *anonymous*. The two kings connected with it are no more "historical" authors than Moses of the Law as it stands now. Even writers with a marked individuality like the authors of *Job* and *Ecclesiastes* we do not know by name. The exception to the rule is *Jesus Siracides*, the author of *Ecclesiasticus*.

Jer. 18,18 mentions "the Wise" as a special class among the spiritual leaders of Israel. Jeremiah had no friendly relations with this class as a whole (cf. also 8,9),

<sup>1)</sup> p. 89.

<sup>2)</sup> the English Authorized Version: 4,30f

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Mowinkel*, in the Norwegian translation, ad. loc.



but he has been closely connected with some of its individual members (cf. Jer. 26,24; 2 Ki 22,12 and Jer. 45). We get an idea of what they were through their literary remains in and outside Israel, the Wisdom literature.

"The Wise" denotes not only "philosophers". It may justly be said that the word signifies "the educated class"<sup>1)</sup>. It is characteristic that its members were people who knew the *art of writing*. Often they are called the "scribes", but then generally a narrower circle is meant, not the common street scribes known in the Orient until this day, the helpers of the illiterate, but *functionaries of state*. "Academic functionaries" were also in ancient times the choice troops of the educated public. The Assyrian minister *Ahikar*, the hero of the romance mentioned before, is called "a wise and erudite scribe", "the counsellor of Assyria", "the Great Seal of Esarhaddon"<sup>2)</sup>. Palestinian scribes were held in high esteem in Ancient Egypt, and an old Canaanite term, *sōfēr māhīr*, also found in different places in the OT, in Egypt is a description of the erudite scribe. According to *Schaeder*, the title of *Ezra*, *sōfēr*, is perhaps an abbreviation of his official Persian title, styling him "State Secretary in the Affairs of the Law of the God of Heaven"<sup>3)</sup>. This hypothesis has however been contested by *Kapelrud*<sup>4)</sup> who maintains the usual OT meaning of the word, the erudite scribe, one who is learned in the laws. This disagreement, however, does not affect the general opinion concerning the scribes as men who were learned in the art of writing and the laws of the state. It is also significant that *Enoch* is called "scribe", "the scribe of justice" (Eth. En. 12,3f.; 95,1). The authors of Egyptian Wisdom books are often described as kings or ministers. This of course is also important for the understanding of the tradition of *Solomon* as the central figure of Wisdom literature and e.g. his position in *Ecclesiastes*<sup>5)</sup>.

These men are animated by a strong consciousness of the importance of their class, elevated above all other professions and trades. *Jesus Siracides* looks down haughtily on tradesmen and farmers (38,24-39,11). Similar utterances we hear from the Egyptian sage *Duauf*.<sup>6)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> *Gressmann*, *Israels Spruchweisheit im Zusammenhang der Weltliteratur* (1925), p. 47. The older view is still upheld by *Wheeler Robinson*, *Inspiration and Revelation*, p. 234.

<sup>2)</sup> Quotations according to the translation in *Charles*, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT* - of the Aramaic recension found in the Jewish colony at Elephantine. The Aramaic text is easily accessible in *Cowley*, *Aramaic Papyri of 5th century B.C.* (1923).

<sup>3)</sup> *H. H. Schaeder*, *Ezra der Schreiber* (1930), pp. 39ff.

<sup>4)</sup> *A. Kapelrud*, *The Question of Authorship in the Ezra narrative* (1944) p. 20f.; cf. also *Egon Johannesen*, *Ezras og Nehemjas Historie* (1946).

<sup>5)</sup> *Kees*, *Ägypten*, p. 192 (*Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft III*, 1, 3, 1).

<sup>6)</sup> *Erman*, *Literatur der Ägypter*, p. 102.

The great *empires* had many functionaries in their civil and military services. The *temples* too used many. *Egypt* seems to have been especially harrassed by its bureaucracy<sup>1)</sup>. – In the service of the state the wise often had a chance of *travelling* to foreign countries and learning their wisdom. If they were used in the Foreign Service they ought to know *foreign languages*, above all the languages of international communication such as *Babylonian*<sup>2)</sup> in the *Amarna* age and the *Aramaic* of the Persian empire.<sup>3)</sup> Among the ministers of *David* we meet the “scribe” (2 Sam. 8,17), significantly enough in the time when Israel had become an important power in Palestine and therefore had to cultivate international relations. According to the best tradition the name of David’s scribe was *Shavsha*, obviously a Babylonian word (1 Chron. 18,16). His family was in office under *Solomon* (1 Ki. 4,3), where the name appears again in a corrupt but easily discernible form. From later times we know the scribe *Shaphan* (2 Ki. 22,3). His son *Ahikam* seems also to have occupied a high position in the state (2 Ki. 22,12; cf. Jer. 26,24). From the same age we have knowledge of another state functionary, “the principal scribe of the host, who mustered the people of the land”, i.e. a war ministry functionary (Jer. 52,52)<sup>4)</sup>.

The Scribes then are mediators of an *international culture* in the same manner as modern academicians. Their education they got at *schools* which we know both from *Babylonia*<sup>5)</sup> and *Egypt*<sup>6)</sup>, and *Ugarit*<sup>7)</sup>. The OT describes the “place in life” of Wisdom teaching: The wise assemble in the *city-gate* or in *open spaces* (Prov. 1,20f.; 8,2f.). The Siracid mentions a *Beth ha-Midrash*, or *Yeshibah*, a “house of learning”, or “circle of learning” (cf. Eccus. 51,23,29; 4,15; 14,23–24; comp. Prov. 9,1). We also have reason to believe that the *temple at Jerusalem*, at any rate in later times, was a place of assembly for the learned men of Judaism<sup>8)</sup>: Here *Paul* was educated at the feet of *Gamaliel*. Temple schools have been found in many places in much older times, e.g. in *Mari* on the Euphrates.

<sup>1)</sup> *Kees*, op. cit., pp. 185ff., 208ff. *Baikie*, A History of Egypt, I, p. 200.

<sup>2)</sup> Already under the Hyksos, Babylonian was used in this way (*Galling*, Biblisches Reallexikon, col. 461).

<sup>3)</sup> Concerning use of *foreign languages*, cf. also the evidence from *Ras Shamra*, *Schaeffer*, The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra (1939), p. 37f.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Gressmann*, op. cit., p. 49.

<sup>5)</sup> *Meissner*, Babylonien und Assyrien II, p. 324ff., cf. the discoveries in *Mari* (literature in Ugaritica (Mission de Ras Shamra, III), p. 16, n. 2).

<sup>6)</sup> *Kees*, op. cit., pp. 47, 86, 191, 281f.

<sup>7)</sup> *Dussaud*, Les découvertes de Ras Shamra (1937), p. 47. *De Langhe*, Les textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit ... I (1945), p. 333f. *Schaeffer*, cf. above, n. 3.

<sup>8)</sup> *Ludin Jansen*, Die spätjüdische Psalmendichtung, pp. 55–63.

And this fact points to the possibility of such schools also existing in Jerusalem in earlier days.

Tradition in these schools mainly rests on *oral instruction*. We have evidence that the sages considered themselves *inspired*<sup>1)</sup> by *God* (Ecclus. 39,6), corresponding to ideas known both in Israel and in Egypt: That Wisdom comes from God, in Egypt from *Thoth*<sup>2)</sup>, in Babylonia from *Nabu*. For Ras Shamra, *Weiser*<sup>3)</sup> refers to an *El ḥokmōt*<sup>4)</sup>. In Israel all wisdom comes from Yahweh: He has created Wisdom as the first of all his works (Prov. 8). Sirach too carries the origin of wisdom back to the first moment of creation (1,44ff.) and speaks of its activity in Israel (24).

In the old times the wise were also *masters of magic* (Is. 3,3), *interpreters of dreams* (Gen. 41,29), *poets* (1 Ki. 5,9–14). Especially the “*Chaldæan*” sages in the Hellenistic epoch were much esteemed all over the Ancient World. This is an important feature in Apocalyptic literature<sup>5)</sup>. But already in earlier times Israel knew the wisdom of Chaldæan magicians (Is. 47,9,13). In the Hellenistic age the word “*Chaldæan*” has changed its meaning from denoting a nation to a signification of a profession (cf. the usage in Dan.). Our knowledge of these “*Chaldæans*” is an important link in our understanding of the legend of the “*wise men from the East*” in the gospel of Mt. *Mowinckel*<sup>6)</sup> in this connection speaks of a “stream of Chaldæan wisdom and Chaldæan sages, astrologers, popular philosophers, itinerant preachers, miracle workers and – charlatans<sup>7)</sup> which in Hellenistic times spread over the world”<sup>8)</sup>. The Acts of the Apostles represent *Paul* fighting against such people both in Cyprus and in Ephesus, and they also know the figure of *Simon Magus*, so elaborately pictured in later legend. *Solomon*, the great magician of legend, is a central personal expression of this motley crowd of men. These features they preserve down to late ages, also when *moral instruction* and *teaching of good manners* have become predominant<sup>9)</sup>. The wise *Daniel* of Apocalyptic still represents this complex

1) cf. *Wheeler Robinson*, *Inspiration and Revelation*, pp. 246ff.

2) *Kees*, op. cit. pp. 100 and 189.

3) p. 12.

4) On this figure, see *Engnell*, *Studies in Divine Kingship*, p. 116; The text II K from Ras Shamra (*Horae Soederblomianae* 1944, p. 17).

5) *Ludin Jansen*, *Die Henochgestalt*, pp. 12–22.

6) *Norsk Teol. Tidsskrift* 1940, p. 236.

7) cf. the examples in the Acts of the Apostles, 8, 9ff.; 13,6ff.; 19,13ff.

8) *Ludin Jansen*, *Existait-il à l'époque hellénistique des prédicateurs intendants juifs?* in *Revue d'hist. et de phil. rel.* 1938.

9) cf. *Hölscher*, *Gesch. d. isr. u. jüd. Rel.*, p. 186, n. 6; the dates are doubtful, cf. also the commentary of *Gemser* on Proverbs.



type<sup>1</sup>). *Enoch* too is a sage, called "the scribe of justice" (1 En. 12,3; 15,1). An evidence of the consciousness of divine *inspiration* among the wise is perhaps Job 4,12 where an oracular formula is used as an introduction to wisdom teaching<sup>2</sup>).

The teaching was generally *oral*. This is affirmed through the formula of introduction: "*Hear, my son!*", cf. Prov. 1,8; 4,1; Ecclus. 3,1. But of course this does not exclude an early literary activity. The education in the circles of the scribes had as one of its principal aims the teaching of the art of writing and of the knowledge of languages<sup>3</sup>). When the sentences speak of the teaching of *father* and *mother* they testify to the fact known from the Orient in general that the first instruction was given the child by the *parents*, and of course orally<sup>3a</sup>). Examples from comparatively early sources of the OT are Ex. 12,26 and Deut. 6,6ff. and 6,20ff. An early evidence of the knowledge of the art of writing we have in Judg. 8,14<sup>4</sup>). We have a strong impression of the manner in which the teaching was literally *beaten* into the disciples through the many exhortations to parents and teachers not to spare the *cane*, and through the many sentences deriding the *lazy sluggard*.

But this oral teaching was, as said above, committed to writing at an early date. The Egyptian Wisdom books are partly very old<sup>5</sup>). The sentences were written down, also as an exercise in writing. "What historical writing of Israel has been from the beginning, the Wisdom literature has become little by little: a literature written by scholars for other scholars"<sup>6</sup>).

Even if this word in both of its parts may be an exaggeration this development must be taken into account for the understanding of this literature. The evolution reveals itself also in the development which *parallelism* undergoes in the Wisdom literature. *Hylmö* points out that the reflective mood of the Wisdom sentence leads to a more acute development of identical and antithetic parallelism than in lyric poetry, and that we find peculiar forms, especially the so-called *parabolical* parallelism or parallelism of *comparison*, generally expressed through the formulae "As . . . . , so . . .", or: "Better is . . . . than . . .", sometimes through the verb *šwh*, "to be similar", but also through asyndetical connection (cf. Prov. 25,25).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. my commentary on Daniel, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>) *Hylmö*, p. 44.

<sup>3</sup>) So *Engnell*, Gamla Testamentet I, p. 65. – I think this must have consequences for the question of the rôle of oral tradition upon the whole (cf. above p. 106).

<sup>3a</sup>) Here the farewell-words to the bride leaving her parents, quoted by *H. Granqvist* (cf. above, p. 134) are important illustrations.

<sup>4</sup>) but comp. above p. 46.

<sup>5</sup>) *Erman*, Lit. d. Äg., cf. the register.

<sup>6</sup>) *Hylmö*, p. 45.

The indisputable fact that Wisdom schools are found at temples has led *Engnell*<sup>1)</sup> to the assumption that the Wisdom literature has its origin in cultic literature, especially in the literature of psalms. That a connection exists should not be denied. It is quite true that we find many *stylistic resemblances* between cultic and Wisdom literature. And the temple schools are of course a strong circumstance in favour of the assumption. Some of the legendary *sages* mentioned in 1 Ki. 5,11 are also made famous by tradition as authors of psalms, and even *Solomon's* name is associated with psalms both in the passage quoted and in the Psalter. Analogies from other temples and cultures, e.g. the Middle Ages, also prove the importance of "ecclesiastics" in the service of the state, on account of their erudition as men of letters. The scribe *Ezra* was of priestly descent.

But on the other hand, we cannot prove this priestly descent in case of all sages. And I think that the form of religion represented in much Wisdom literature, which cannot be said to betray much interest in the cultus, should warn us against talking of *the* root of Wisdom literature in this connection. Trade and commerce, and the political activities of kings and other leaders of state, even the traditional idea that the authors of Wisdom literature are kings and statesmen, in my opinion, and in spite of the importance of the idea of divine kingship, speak against one-sidedness in considering this question. All the officials of Egypt who were trained in the schools of the kingdom cannot have been "ecclesiastics" and "clerks" in the sense of the Middle Ages. They must also have been "clerks" in the modern sense of the word, some of them.

But as underlined before, there is a great amount of truth in *Engnell's* idea. The Wisdom literature betrays much formal influence from the poetry of the psalms, e.g. the Book of Job<sup>2)</sup>. The scheme "benediction . . . curse" e.g. in Ps. 112, cf. Ps. 1, and in the concluding exhortatory speeches of Deuteronomy<sup>3)</sup> is a link between psalm literature and Wisdom, and it is very probable that the former has the priority. But this cannot lead to the conclusion that the *specific activity* creating the Wisdom literature, the work of teaching, must have developed its characteristic, original forms in connection with cultic functions *exclusively*. It is important, also in this field to be able to point out that culture and religion, Wisdom and theology, are originally closely connected. But we must not close our eyes to other possibilities. Among the material characteristic of Wisdom we must above all point to the "sentence", the proverb. *Engnell* has

1) Gamla testamentet I, p. 57 and 62 and 64. – In Mesopotamia the wise men were identified with the priests (*Dürr*, Das Erziehungswesen im AT, p. 60, cf. *Wheeler Robinson*, Inspiration and Revelation, p. 244; *G. R. Driver*, Semitic Writing, p. 62, n. 4).

2) cf. above, p. 151 and below, p. 164f.

3) *Mowinkel*, Psalmenstudien V.

not told us how to derive this feature from the cult, or cultic literature. The *māšāl* may have some remote connections with incantations and prophetic words, as a "powerful word". But we do not know anything of this yet. Most natural is it to regard the proverb in its function in the Wisdom literature as a *means of teaching*, as created even for this purpose, maybe in temple circles: but that does not necessarily mean that it is a "cultic" word.

A phenomenon which in this connection might be quoted in favour of Engnell's theory is the so-called "Beatitude", best known from the NT (Mt. 5!), but also frequent in the OT, cf. the opening words of Ps. 1. It is generally believed to be a formula peculiar to the Wisdom literature. But as form of *benediction* it seems to belong to the cultic sphere. It may be an inheritance from times when wise men and other *mōšēlīm*, bards and seers, were not so keenly distinguished from each other as later.<sup>1)</sup>

Characteristic of Wisdom literature is further its *admonishing* tone, cf. the typical introductions "Hear!", "Hark!", "Look!", "Beware!". This may also have connections with cultic formulas (cf. pp. 188ff.). In a work quoted above *Boström* has further shown that the teachers of Wisdom have taken great interest in what is called "*paronomasia*"<sup>2)</sup>. *Alliterations* occur frequently. More problematic is the existence of *assonance*, because we know so little of the exact pronunciation of Hebrew in the times before the introduction of the systems of punctuation<sup>3)</sup>. Now and then we find something like a *rhyme*, and rather frequent is *anomination*, the combination of words etymologically related to one another. The sages often refer to their *personal experience* (Prov. 24,30-34, cf. Job 5,23; Ps. 37,23,35; also in Eccles. and very frequently in Eccles.)<sup>4)</sup>

But to return: *the literary unit par excellence* of Wisdom is the *proverbial sentence*. In its parallel sections, rhythmically spoken, the thought of the sage must be expressed completely and finally. It is not necessary that there is connection between the sentences of a Wisdom book (Prov. 10,1ff.). But nevertheless we notice that there are attempts to combine formally similar sentences, or sentences of similar meaning, so that apparently greater units are formed. This may however originally be a device of *oral tradition*, a form of *mnemotechnic* art. We find combinations of sentences beginning with the same word (cf. Prov. 26,4f.; 25,25f.; 26,1ff.; Eccles. 7,1-6). In Prov. 11,9-12 all sentences begin with

<sup>1)</sup> The possibility of a cultic origin of the benedictions of Wisdom literature was also noted in the Danish edition of this work, p. 277. - Cf. Ringgren, Svensk Exeg. Årsbok 1948, p. 14.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. also Olinder, Zur Terminologie der semitischen Lautähnlichkeiten (1934).

<sup>3)</sup> Hylmō, p. 48.

<sup>4)</sup> The predominance of *experience* in the Wisdom literature is strongly emphasized by Wheeler Robinson in the chapters on Wisdom in his posthumous work *Inspiration and Revelation*.



the same preposition<sup>1)</sup>. This is a form of *catchword-principle*, known from other parts of orally delivered tradition, e.g. the tradition of the gospel-material of the NT and in the OT prophetic books. It can also be compared with the *alphabetic* order of the lines in certain psalms, notoriously related to Wisdom literature, cf. also the poem of Prov. 31 (the *acrostic style*). Another peculiar style, endeavoring to combine several sentences, possibly also of *mnemotechnic* character, is the *numerical style*<sup>2)</sup>. e.g. Prov. 30,23ff. (cf. Amos 1-2), cf. also Prov. 30,18f., 21-23. It is generally supposed that sentences of this kind originally have been *riddles*<sup>3)</sup>.

Combinations of several proverbs look rather mechanical when effected in these ways. But perhaps it is not always so. The *alphabetical* sections may have some relation to the ideas of *compelling forces* in certain combinations of letters and sounds<sup>4)</sup>: The letters were believed to be full of "magic", and the oldest *hieroglyphs* were characterized by a word meaning "gods"<sup>5)</sup>. – But we also find combinations which in our eyes too look *logical*, e.g. when the admonitions of the sages are followed by sentences, giving reasons for them (cf. e.g. Prov. 1,8). This latter feature by and by leads to the *disintegration of the proverbial form*: A series of admonitions are combined with longer sections explaining the reasons. This is generally considered a sign of origin from later ages, this form mostly occurring in younger works such as Ecclus. and the Wisdom of Solomon. Hence it is inferred that the parts of Prov. exhibiting this form, i.e. the first 9 chapters, are of younger date. The same occurs in another late book, Ecclesiastes. The formation of longer sections of this kind may also be explained stylistically as a transitional form between the acrostic style and the logical combination, in which transitional form proverbs talking of the same subject are combined, e.g. the proverbs on kings, Prov. 16,10-15.

*Hylmö*<sup>6)</sup> justly observes that this must not lead us to believe that the sages substantially have only been people delivering current phrases. We also have to regard them as *creative* workers who transform the common material and coin new proverbs and admonitions. In their circles the different *collections* e.g. in Prov. have sprung up; cf. also the so-called "Catechism" in Tob. 4,3-19. Such pieces illustrate their activity as collectors preserving old material. But their *creative activity* we encounter in works stamped by the personality of great

<sup>1)</sup> Eissfeldt, p. 94.

<sup>2)</sup> so *Hylmö*.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. below, p. 179f.

<sup>4)</sup> Boström, Paronomasi, pp. 16ff.

<sup>5)</sup> Weiser, p. 12; Kees, Ägypten, p. 277f.

<sup>6)</sup> p. 50.

poets like the author of Job, and in men like the authors of Eccles. Wisdom, Ben Sira, or in the Book of Enoch, the latter placing Wisdom in the service of the preparation of the soul and of the people for the impending Day of Judgment. Even if Job, Eccles., Wisd., and Sirach in many respects betray their relations to forms and ideas of the surrounding Ancient Eastern countries they nevertheless have given a contribution to the debate on views of the world, surpassing what Babylonian and Egyptian sages have produced, both regarding poetical form and profundity of the thoughts.

### Other types of Wisdom literature.

The sentential form is the characteristic, but not the only type used by the wise. Already the description of *Solomon's* wisdom alludes to other types. In 1 Ki. 5,12ff, besides *māšāl* and *šir*, also talks concerning *plants* and *animals* are attributed to this king of the wise. In 10,1 we are told how the *queen of Sheba* proved his wisdom with "hard questions". The Hebrew word means "*riddles*". Accordingly, tradition makes Solomon author of *fables* on plants and animals, and of the *riddles*, which perhaps lie behind the numerical proverbs.<sup>1)</sup>

### *The Riddle.*

The *riddle*, *ḥidāh*, is an old ingredient of popular poetry, not only in Israel<sup>2)</sup>. Primitive peoples highly value the proof of sagacity which reveals itself in capacity to express profound thoughts by means of analogies and similitudes. *Tor Andræ* says that the mode of thinking which appears in the *riddles* is narrowly akin to *mythical* thinking. In both "mist and wind are living creatures, clouds are cows in Rigveda as in German riddles, day and night are sisters who at the same time look after their children, the sun and the moon. But nevertheless the word "riddle" is generally only used where the analogy is no longer understood as relation in substance and the similitude not as an attribute of substance. The riddle therefore corresponds to the myth nearly as the fairy tale to the legend which is considered to agree with reality". But riddle and myth are still narrowly related. The riddle frequently is an expression of the sacred secret which is the property of a community and its watchword, or which constitutes the life-secret of a demoniac being (the Sphinx). Contests in the solving of riddles perhaps aim rather at substantiating the magic power of the contesting parties than at a proof of intelligence; cf. the fact that Solomon in

<sup>1)</sup> cf. above, p. 176.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Tor Andræ*, in RGG, 2nd ed., s. v. Rätsel.

legend is the great magician, the ruler of the demons. *Tor Andrae* supposes that the idea of the riddle as the common secret knowledge of the community explains the custom of solving riddles at initiation ceremonies, at wooing, and at wedding ceremonies. In this field we again see the possibility of driving an element of Wisdom literature back to the origin in ancient rites.<sup>1)</sup>

Of *riddles at weddings* one or perhaps two instances appear in the OT, in the narrative of the wedding festival of *Samson* (Judg. 14, 12ff.). The story-teller here certainly considers 14, 14b the riddle and 14, 18a the solution. But it is very probable that in reality the latter passage is an independent riddle, by which the Philistines are teasing Samson<sup>2)</sup>; for the answer is no real answer to the riddle of the bridegroom. The real answer should be: "Honey came from the lion". The answer is given elegantly in a new riddle which draws Samson's attention to the fact that he has met a power stronger than himself, not the lion, but *love* which has made him weak against the questioning of his bride<sup>3)</sup>. But at the same time it contains the words "lion" and "honey", revealing that Samson's riddle has been solved. Moreover it is not quite improbable that the first riddle from the beginning was independent of the narrative to which it now has been attached, for it can be solved in another way, without references to the story of Samson<sup>4)</sup>: The answer should then be, "to vomit!"

We have no other examples of riddles in the OT. But in the story of the queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon there is an allusion to the custom of trying men's wits by riddles, cf. also 3 Esdr. 3, 5 and the Letter of Aristeas § 183-300. In this connection it is observed by *Hylmö*<sup>5)</sup> and *Eissfeldt*<sup>6)</sup> that Prov. 1, 6 places the riddle side by side with the proverb. Daniel is described as a man capable in the art of solving riddles (5, 12), and who once by God's help got powers to guess the contents of king Nebuchadnezzar's dream which the king had forgotten (Dan. 2<sup>7)</sup>). This is regarded as proof that he was inspired by God.

We have mentioned above that the *numerical proverbs* (Prov. 26 and 30) may be – originally – riddles. The same is perhaps the case with the form of *comparison*. *Hylmö*<sup>8)</sup> notes that Prov. 23, 29f. and 30, 4 have only apparently preserved the form of riddle. Here we have – more probably – a purely formal use of the interrogative form to animate the sentence.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. above p. 174f.

<sup>2)</sup> *Gressmann*, *Die Anfänge Israels* (SAT I, 2, 1922), p. 243, cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 91f. On Samson's riddle, see *Tur-Sinai*, in *Symbolae ... Hrozny dedicatae* II, p. 419.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. the first subject of the speech of the third of the boys in 3 Esdr. 3-4.

<sup>4)</sup> *Gressmann*, loc. cit.

<sup>5)</sup> p. 51. <sup>6)</sup> p. 92.

<sup>7)</sup> concerning the motive of the forgotten dream, cf. literature quoted in my commentary.

<sup>8)</sup> p. 52.



### Parables.

The *parable* is a development of the *comparison* used in some sentences<sup>1)</sup>. In the books of the prophets we find that the prophets often used this type, cf. Is. 28,4b exhibiting the original short form, capable of development into elaborate narratives like the unsurpassed parables of Jesus. In the OT this form is represented e.g. by the story told by *Nathan* (2 Sam. 12,1-4). The song of the vineyard in Is. 5,1-7<sup>2)</sup> is generally called a parable, but I feel more inclined to label it an allegory.

Formally this poem is a *love song*, and it contains several features capable of being allegorical metaphors describing the care of the lover for his beloved. She is pictured as the vineyard which was watched and cultivated and planted in the best manner possible. This is probably *erotic symbolic language*. In the love songs the vineyard is a symbol of the beauty of the female body (Cant. 1,5f.; 2,15; 8,12)<sup>3)</sup>. But the application in Is. is analogous of that of *Nathan*. The listeners are induced to pass judgment on themselves, believing that they are giving verdict on another person. It is not right to say – with *Hylmö*<sup>4)</sup> – that the third strophe of the poem (v. 5-6) is completely dominated by the oracular style. It is no oracle, but a *curse* like that in 2 Sam. 1,21<sup>5)</sup>. Nor is the prophet speaking in v. 3-4, but the “friend”. The prophet’s voice is heard in v. 1 and in v. 7, the latter v. giving the *interpretation* of the poem. – The common opinion in commentaries since *Ewald*, that the prophet by and by, esp. in v. 6, gives daring hints of his interpretation, that the poem in reality deals with Yahweh’s relations to the people, is also wrong. The prophet has not played with the fire and betrayed his intentions, so that the hearers might evade the concluding curse<sup>6)</sup>.

### Fables.

Related to the parable is the *fable* which is also a narrative. But its characteristic feature is that its “*dramatis personæ*” are not human beings, but *animals* and *plants*. Animal and plant fables are alluded to in the description of *Solomon* (1 Ki. 5). In *Ezekiel* we find a couple of animal fables (17,3ff.; 19,1ff.). The most famous plant fable is the story of *Jotham* of the trees and their attempt to choose a king (Judg. 9,7-15), mocking the institution of kingship. Another specimen, in prose form, is found in 2 Ki. 14,9.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 173.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. my commentary.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Haller's* commentary.

<sup>4)</sup> p. 53.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. pp. 130 and 136.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. *Archiv für Orientforschung* IV, 1927, pp. 209-10. That the poem is no parable is also maintained by *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet* I, p. 66, n. 2.

*Allegory.*

Different from the parable is the *allegory*, also frequently used by the prophets. As its main characteristic, distinguishing it from the parable, the allegory has a *series of metaphors*, all with their meaning, while the parable generally has only one point of comparison. The metaphors are often *personifications* of inanimate things or abstract ideas. As example of the first kind we may point to Is. 10,15, cf. Ahikar (Elephantine version, col. VII, 104). The same thought is expressed in Is. 45,9b. Allegorical personification also appears in Amos's funeral dirge in the Virgin Israel (5,1ff.). This metaphor, "The Daughter of Zion", "The Daughter of Babel", cf. the Whore Babylon, Apoc. 17,5, is very frequent. An allegory of this kind is perhaps also the love song Is. 5,1-7 (cf. above). It is uncertain if Hylmö<sup>1)</sup> is right in his assumption that Job 38,8ff. and Ps. 104,4 contain allegorical personifications of powers of nature. But *mythological* material of this kind can be used in the service of allegory, like the personifications of virtues and vices of men. To this category belongs the personification of *Wisdom* (Prov. 8, esp. v. 22ff.; Ecclus. 4,11ff.; 24,1ff.; 13ff., Wisd. 6-10). In contrast to Wisdom the sages introduce *Folly* personified (Prov. 9,13), described as a harlot<sup>2)</sup>. Other allegorical figures are found Ez. 17,3; 19,1ff.; 23,2ff.; Is. 63,1-6. In Ps. 85,11-12 we find the personification of virtues, cf. 89,15. Some of these passages perhaps contain mythological remnants of the kind sometimes found in the visions of Ez. and Zech.

Longer and more elaborate allegories are found in Eccl. In 11,9-12,7, the allegorical - often very obscure - description of old age in 12,1-7 is being connected with a preceding admonition to enjoy life before old age and death prevents it. But most allegories are found in prophetic poetry. Ez. 17,1-24 gives an allegorical description of Zedekiah's breach of truce, and Ez. 23 one of the harlot Israel. The same kind of speech is perhaps found in the chapter on the resurrection of Israel (Ez. 37), and in ch. 15 and 16. In the style of a funeral dirge we meet a great allegory in Ez. 19, cf. the often-mentioned piece of Is. 5,1-7, where the style of the love song is used. Hylmö further points out that some *visions* of prophets are related to allegory, just as the *interpretation of dreams* and similar features in Apocalyptic have this character. Nevertheless we must be cautious in interpreting events from the life of the prophets as allegories: as *instar omnium* the marriage-story of Hosea may be mentioned.

<sup>1)</sup> p. 54.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. G. Boström, *Proverbiastudien* (1935) on the mythological ideas behind this personification: the cult of the fertility goddess.

*Prose forms. The Diatribe.*

It must be noted that both fable, parable and allegory at an early date (2 Ki. 14,9; 2 Sam. 12,1ff.) are found in *prosaic* form, as narratives. And in the later and latest Wisdom literature we observe an increasing predominance of prosaic forms. Part of Wisd. is in prose. This tendency is strengthened through the introduction of *Hellenistic* forms of literature, e.g. the *diatribe* in 4 Macc.

Concerning the *diatribe*, see the brilliant description in *Wendland, Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur*, pp. 77ff.; cf. also below, p. 255.

Types from other spheres of culture.

Mentioning the Hellenistic diatribe we have touched the problem of "foreign types" in Wisdom literature. If we use this expression in the same sense as above (p. 159ff): of types belonging not to the categories specifically characteristic of the teaching of the sages, but to other "places in life" of Oriental culture, we may also point to types which are not "outlandish" as the diatribe. But this is not easily done. The types of Wisdom literature, setting aside the proverbial sentence, cannot be so distinctly separated from other spheres of life. The use of psalm forms, e.g., is ambiguous. We have seen that Wisdom literature at least to some extent may be connected with cultic literature. But on the other hand we also find in more recent times the forms of psalmody used in a manner indicating the taking over of these forms by the wise<sup>1)</sup>. The forms of the psalms are also of great importance for the understanding of the forms used in the speeches of the Book of Job.<sup>2)</sup>

*The Book of Job* as a whole is in this connection very interesting. Its peculiar form, the *dialogue*, has no parallels in the OT, e.g. not in the discussion-speeches of Malachi. Nor is the book a *drama*. *Theodorus of Mopsuestia* was condemned as a heretic int. al. for the opinion that the poet of Job imitated heathen tragedies<sup>3)</sup>. But he was wrong. The book contains a dialogue, set in the frame of a prose narrative, "a combination of the epic prose narrative and a poetic dialogue of lyrical character"<sup>4)</sup>. The philosopher *Karl Fries*<sup>5)</sup> attempts to place it in the category of "*philosophical conversation*", of which he adduces examples from all the world. Keeping inside the horizon of Israel we must

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 166.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 164f. – Prov. 1,21 reminds of prophetic speeches of reproach (cf. pp. 198ff.).

<sup>3)</sup> *Lindblom*, *Boken om Job*, p. 273, cf. *La composition du livre de Job* (1946).

<sup>4)</sup> *Lindblom*, p. 275.

<sup>5)</sup> *Das philosophische Gespräch von Hiob bis Platon* (1940), cf. *Carsten Höeg, Cicero* (1942), pp. 282ff.



especially refer to *Egyptian* and *Babylonian* parallels. In *Egypt* we find a poem, "The Dialogue between the World-Wearry and his Soul", and on Babylonian soil we have a pessimistic conversation between a man and his slave. Ben Sira (Ecclus. 6,32f.; 9,15; 51,23) gives examples showing the part played in the schools by the conversation among the sages. Besides this Lindblom<sup>1)</sup> points to the discussions in court as a probable background of the book, and he proves that legal forms are found in the speech of *Eliphaz* in ch. 22 and in the oath of purgation in ch. 31. He also points to many formulas like "What is my fault?"; accusations like "You seek my life knowing that I am not guilty", challenges, prayers for mercy etc. as proof of the same. We hear of bail and shaking hands, accusation documents and speech of defence etc.

But this only means that a great many items have been collected, forms of poetry used by the poet. The dialogue as a whole has – like the subject of the book: the problem of suffering – parallels in the lands surrounding Palestine, but also in *India* (the story of the pious Harischandra), and in Greek tragedies<sup>2)</sup>. Apparently even the *Babylonian* material offers means to understand the formal problem of the dialogue of Job. Lindblom<sup>3)</sup> rightly underlines that the Babylonian poem most nearly akin to Job, the poem of a sufferer and his salvation, after its first words labelled "I will serve the lord of Wisdom", is in reality a *psalm*, a combined psalm of lamentation and of thanksgiving, which has certainly been used in the temple-cult. But it is easily observed how the parallel poems in dialogue form are only a further development of the the situation of the psalm of lamentation and its forms. The psalm too knows of friends who talk in a way which must make the sufferer regard them as enemies (Ps. 41,10; 55,13ff.). The dialogue is a "dramatization" of the psalm of lamentation, more accurately, of the "prayers of the accused", placed in the frame of a narrative. Whether the "dramatization" has been developed under the influence of "the philosophical conversation" or of the dialogue in courts of justice cannot be said with precision. But the poem of Job itself seems to give a hint. According to the framework of the book, the narrative, the friends of Job arrive to console Job. Is it not probable that this feature has been borrowed from reality? The consolators who in daily life came to console a mourner or a sufferer might easily get into a situation like that described in the Book of Job. So the dialogue in a natural way grows under the hand of the poet, and in this situation he is able to use the many forms, especially of psalms of lamentation, which he displays in his lyrics.

<sup>1)</sup> Lindblom, pp. 276ff. <sup>2)</sup> Lindblom, pp. 31ff. <sup>3)</sup> p. 33, cf. AOT, p. 273ff.; Barton, Archaeology and the Bible, pp. 490ff. – Cf. Stamm, Das Leiden des Unschuldigen in Israel und Babylon (1946). – É. Dhorme, Eccl. or Job (Rev. Bibl. (1923 = Recueil É. Dhorme 1951).

A somewhat similar explanation of the forms of Job has been attempted by Engnell<sup>1</sup>). He also starts from Babylonian psalms, finding some "royal psalms of innocence" with "negative confession" as transition-types to the poem mentioned above, the *ludlul bēl nimêqi*, which again is connected with other Babylonian poems of the "Job-type". Thus Engnell draws the lineage of the Job-figure back to the "royal ideology" and its passion-rites. This idea is also well worth noticing. But we cannot hope, nevertheless, that the final word on the literary form of Job has yet been said.

Finally we must notice that the later *Apocalypses* are also works emanating from the circles of the wise. In these books too many forms of literature are accumulated, just as we here meet the manifold *learning* of the wise<sup>2</sup>): We here encounter int. al. "scientific" sections, dealing e.g. with *astronomical* and other heavenly matters examined by the wise, because it is thought that these things help to determine the time and date of the Day of Judgment. *Astrology* is here combined with the older prophetic speeches of doom to shape the preaching of the apocalyptic writers. In this material are also found elements of *apocalyptic historiography* (Dan. 11, et al.) with its theory of *world periods* (Dan. 2; 7; 8; 9; etc.). Wisdom in this way swallows up prophecy<sup>3</sup>).

*Literature:* Meinhold, *Die Weisheit Israels* (1908). Gressmann (cf. above, p. 170, n. 1). Boström (cf. p. 168, n. 4 and p. 180 n. 2). Humbert, *Recherches sur les sources Égyptiennes de la littérature sapientiale d'Israël* (1928). Fichtner, *Die altorientalische Weisheit in ihrer israelitisch-jüdischen Ausprägung* (1933). Baumgartner, *Israelitische und altorientalische Weisheit* (1933). Ranston, *The Old Testament Wisdom Books* (1930). Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature* (1936). G. R. Driver, *Semitic Writing*, pp. 62ff.; Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom* (1947).

*Theologische Rundschau* 1933, pp. 254-88 (reviews), cf. ZATW 1936, pp. 153ff.

*Texts* from outside Israel in translation in AOT and Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*. Especially for *Egyptian* texts: Erman, *Literatur der Ägypter* (also in English translation). Volten, *Das demotische Weisheitsbuch* (1941). The text of *Ahikar* in Cowley's edition of the Elephantine-texts (cf. p. 170 n. 2), translation also in Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* II. - Baumgartner's essay in *The OT and Modern Study*, ed. by Rowley (1951), with bibliography.

### Oracles.

Proceeding to examine the forms of oracles immediately after the Wisdom literature we must, for the justification of this arrangement - remind readers of what was said about the expression *māsāl*, above p. 167f: This word is not

<sup>1</sup>) Gamla testamentet I, p. 68, cf. *Studies in Divine Kingship*, p. 48, n. 7.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. pp. 171ff. The relation to *prophecy* must however not be forgotten, cf. the very illuminating pages of H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1947), pp. 11-50.

<sup>3</sup>) Ludin J. p. 11, *Die Henochgestalt* (1940), pp. 66ff.



only used of popular proverbs and the sentences of the wise, but also of the "powerful words" of seers and bards. And the oracle too is a powerful word, used e.g. of the prophetic benedictions of Balaam.

The *Latin oraculum* denotes both the sanctuary from which the words of gods are issued (the Oracle at Delphi) and the *divine answer* (an oracle from Delphi) conveyed to the guest of the sanctuary from its *numen* through the mouth of prophet or priest. Here of course the word is taken in the latter meaning.

Generally a distinction is made between *priestly* and *prophetic* oracles. But the distinction is not easily carried through, the two types having influenced one another, or rather, perhaps, because the literary forms are much the same in priestly and in prophetic circles, prophets often being a class of temple functionaries. Generally the *priestly* oracle is assumed to be characterized through the use of *technical* means and *liturgical* formulas and its being proclaimed in a quiet, dignified form. On the other hand the *prophetic* oracle originates in ecstatic experience and accordingly is of a more violent and revolutionary character. But already Mowinckel<sup>1)</sup> has proved that the two kinds of oracles are not easily distinguished, because *cultic prophecy*, institutional prophecy, was connected with the temples (1 Sam. 10,10; 19,18; 1 Ki. 13,17; 2 Ki. 2, 5), also with the sanctuary at Jerusalem (Is. 28,7-13; Jer. 29,24-32). And in this connection he notes that cultic literature (the psalms) also contains cult-prophetic oracles<sup>2)</sup>. Priests are described as seized by prophetic ecstasy (2 Chron. 20,13-17), and sons of priests become prophets (Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah). This explains the circumstance that the forms used by the two kinds of oracles are much the same.

These points have of late been stressed by Engnell<sup>3)</sup> and Haldar<sup>4)</sup> and earlier by A. R. Johnson<sup>5)</sup>. Recent research shows a growing tendency to stress the connection rather than the difference between priests and prophets<sup>6)</sup>. The priests had the important work of giving oracles, and this meant much more to them than the functioning at sacrifices. But in spite of Engnell's emphatic words protesting the difference between the two kinds of oracles to be imagi-

<sup>1)</sup> Psalmenstudien III.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. my Indledning til de gammeltestamentlige Salmer, pp. 140-144.

<sup>3)</sup> Gamla testamentet I (1945), pp. 69ff.

<sup>4)</sup> Associations of Cult Prophets (1945).

<sup>5)</sup> The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel (1944); cf. also of course Johs. Pedersen, Israel, its Life and Culture III-IV, p. 121 and other places, already in the Danish edition from 1934. Engnell (p. 69, n. 1) enumerates other works.

<sup>6)</sup> Welch, Prophet and Priest in Old Israel (1936). Hoschander, The Priests and Prophets (1938). Johs. Pedersen, in Studies pres. to T.H. Robinson (1950).



nary<sup>1)</sup> he nevertheless preserves the distinctive mark that the prophetic oracle is stamped by its psychological origin in ecstasy<sup>2)</sup>. Against *Haldar's* thesis that all prophets in reality are members of the priesthoods, *H. H. Rowley*<sup>3)</sup> with his usual equilibrium of judgment has pronounced that this "goes beyond the evidence and ignores the variety of type, function and relation to the priesthood of Israelite prophets", and advocates that "more cautious scholarship may yet recognize that sharp lines of division are not to be drawn, though differences are to be recognized. Hard lines do not divide the colours of the spectrum, yet the colours are not all to be identified. There were prophets who stood beside the priests as cultic officials, though probably serving the cultus in different ways<sup>4)</sup>". Accordingly with cautious reservations we think it justified to retain the distinction between prophetic and priestly oracles. We cannot call it "imaginary", even if it is not so clear-cut as we could wish.

### The Priestly Oracle.

We have no special collections of priestly oracles in the OT. Material for its description must be sought in all parts of the scriptures, both in legal, historical, prophetic, and poetical books.

#### *Technique.*

From early days Israel has possessed certain *technical* means to obtain oracles, and it has also known the oracular forms of the neighbouring nations. We find traces of an oracle seeking divine answers through the *flowering* of different plants (the "Tannhäuser-motive"), when they had been placed for a day and a night in the sanctuary (Num. 17, 1ff.). Divine signals were also found in the sound of the *wind* in the trees of a wood (2 Sam. 5, 22ff.), cf. the oracle of Zeus in the sacred oak-grove of Dodona. Attention has been drawn to the name of a sacred tree near Sichem, Gen. 12, 6; Judg. 9, 37: "The Terebinth of the Soothsayer". In *Egypt* and *Babylonia* omens were obtained by observation of *water* (hydromantia), reminding us of the cup of Joseph (Gen. 44, 5). Gen. 15, 1ff. is thought to allude to the observation of *birds* (auspiciation).

<sup>1)</sup> cf. e.g. p. 69f.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 72.

<sup>3)</sup> The Unity of the Old Testament, p. 8.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. also the literature quoted by *Rowley* in this connection: *R. B. Y. Scott*, The Relevance of Prophecy (1944). *Humbert*, in ZATW 1926, pp. 266ff. and in Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 1932, p. 1ff.; Problèmes du livre d'Habacuc (1944). *Rowley*, The Nature of Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study, in Harvard Theol. Rev. (1945).

Ez. 21,12 mentions the *liver oracles* (hepatoscopia) of the Babylonians. Probably Gen. 4,4 also alludes to some observation of the sacrificial animals, perhaps their intestines (haruspicum) – this however cannot be the explanation in the case of the vegetable-offering of Cain. The *casting of lots*, in different forms used nearly all over the world, was the principal priestly oracle of Israel (the *'ūrīm and tummīm*). Akin to this oracle is the divination by *arrows* mentioned in Ez. 21,26 as used by the Babylonians, and as used by Israel perhaps in Hos. 4,12. The *incubation* and its formulas we find Gen. 28,11ff., 1 Sam. 3, and 1 Ki. 3,5ff., perhaps also in the parody of Job 4,12–21<sup>1</sup>). The prohibited conjuring of the *dead*, necromancy, is described in 1 Sam. 28, cf. Is. 8,19; Deut. 18,11; Lev. 19,31; 20,6; 20,27.

### *The Form of the Oracle.*

When the priest had consulted the oracle the result of the operation had to be imparted to the person or the community seeking advice. This of course was done in forms fixed by tradition. This is the foundation for the study of the *style* of the oracle. There are of course many situations described in the OT which are not illuminative in this respect. We certainly cannot conclude much from the short answers to David 1 Sam. 23,6ff. Probably they are connected with the technique of the drawing of the sacred lots involving that the questions necessarily had to be put in the form: "Shall I do this or this?" by which the form of answer was determined (cf. the descriptions Jos. 7, and 1 Sam. 14 (supplied from the Greek translation))<sup>2</sup>).

But we have texts expressly said to be oracles in the truest sense of the word. Like the Delphic answers they seem to have had *rhythmic* form: Gen. 25,23, cf. Gen 16,11.; Judg. 13,3–5. In these cases we may suppose that the storyteller has imitated the priestly form<sup>3</sup>). The answer of Eli to Hannah (1 Sam. 1,17) perhaps also indicates how oracles looked: *Hylmō*<sup>4</sup>) refers to Lk. 8,48 and supposes that the pattern in these passages exhibits the form of a *favourable oracle*. Corresponding to this he assumes that an unfavourable oracle has resembled Mt. 4,10, cf. Mc. 8,33. We cannot be quite sure of this. On the

<sup>1</sup>) Engnell, Gamla testamentet I, p. 70 thinks that the *incubation*-oracle originally was a privilege of the king. The examples mentioned above at any rate are connected with sacral persons of a class to which "kings" belong, cf. also my Det sakrale kongedømme, pp. 125ff.

<sup>2</sup>) Eissfeldt, p. 76.

<sup>3</sup>) *Hylmō*, p. 63.

<sup>4</sup>) loc. cit.

other hand *Hylmō* is probably right in finding a prophetic imitation of a liturgical oracle in Jer. 15,1, cf. Ps. 99.

The oracle may be imparted in the 1st person singular, i.e. as the *verba ipsissima Dei*. An example is found in Ps. 60,8, introduced by a solemn formula: "God has spoken in his sanctuary", corresponding to the well-known "Thus saith the Lord" of the prophets. A similar introduction to an oracle is found in the *Amarna* letters<sup>1)</sup>: "Thus saith Ishtar of Nineveh, the mistress of all the lands..." This formula clearly originates from the words spoken by messengers, and accordingly German scholars speak of "Botenspruch"-style, the style of messengers. The introduction may be expanded into a *hymnic* section in which the deity describes itself<sup>2)</sup>. This is very common in connection with descriptions of *theophanies* (Gen. 17,1; 26,24; 28,13; 46,3; Ex. 3,6; 6,2 – prose imitations of this sort of hymnic self-introductions, cf. Ps. 50,1-7). The theophanies are often followed by the exhortation "Fear not!", presupposing that the appearance of God always produces fear<sup>3)</sup>. – The form of the 1st person is also found in Ps. 81,6bff, cf. 95,7bff.

But the oracle may also be communicated to the suppliant in relating form, in the 3rd person sing. This form is found in Ps. 85,9ff and 20,7.

Most of these oracles are *unconditional*. But others introduce a condition to be fulfilled in order that the answer may be favourable, e.g. in Ps. 24,5 and 132, cf. the prose rendering in the words of Nathan, 2 Sam. 7.

### *Benediction and Curse.*

Among the forms of the priestly oracle formulas of *benediction* and *curse* also are reckoned<sup>4)</sup>. Deuteronomistic and Aaronitic-priestly legal literature (Deut. 21,5; Num. 6,24-27) both emphasize that one of the great privileges of the priests is to bless the people. The latter of the two passages quoted, the "Aaronitic Benediction", is one of the solemn formulas for this function, still living in the Churches of the Reformation. Ecclus. describes the impression of this moment of the service on the congregation when the High Priest Simon (ca. 200 B.C.) officiated, – We have already mentioned the benedictions of the patriarchs in Genesis<sup>5)</sup>. They perhaps also belong to this class of literature. Very characteristic in this connection is the blessing pronounced

<sup>1)</sup> ed. Knudtzon, no. 23.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 151.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. Otto, *Das Heilige* (1920), pp. 149ff.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. above, p. 144.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. pp. 141ff.



on Abraham by the priest-king *Melchizedek* (Gen. 14,19–20). We also observe that the benedictions, or curses, are considered fate-determining for nations and tribes. – Short formulas are also found in Ps. 128,5 and 129,8; 134,3. Many of them belong to everyday life as forms of *greeting*. But as blessings they must have some connection with cultic forms. In Judg. 17,2 the blessing is pronounced by a *woman*, but of course it illustrates current forms. It gives a strong impression of the belief in the objective effect of benediction and curse, and also illustrates passages as Lev. 5,1; Prov. 29,24, cf. below our examination of the *ordalia*<sup>1)</sup>.

Many of these forms of blessing are very old. *Hylmö*<sup>2)</sup> quotes as a parallel to the Aaronitic benediction a polytheistic Babylonian verse using nearly the same expressions:

“Ea rejoice over thee,  
Damkina, the queen of the ocean, illumine thee by her face,  
Marduk, the prince of the gods, raise up thy head”.

Benedictions were not only pronounced on men, but also on God, originally as means of strengthening the divine powers, but in later times re-interpreted as formulas of praise. This is the common meaning in the OT<sup>3)</sup>.

Formulas of *curse* are also known. The opposite of the *bārūk* or the *’ašrē* of the blessing is the *’arūr* of malediction. Also the particle *hoi* may be used, as seen in the prophets. A liturgical curse is probably at the background of Deut. 27,16ff. In liturgies formulas of benediction and malediction have sometimes been combined, directed against different groups of men<sup>4)</sup>.

### *Liturgical tōrāh.*

An important subject of priestly oracles has been the treatment of problems of cultic life. This is illustrated through the situation described in Haggai 2,11ff., where the prophet asks for a priestly oracle concerning the contagious-

<sup>1)</sup> p. 190.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 67. – cf. *Gressmann*, SAT, I, 2 (1922), p. 98; also *Jastrow*, *Die Religion Babylo-niens und Assyriens* I, p. 343:

“May the word of Ea shine forth!  
May Damkina guide rightly!  
O Marduk, firstborn Son of the Abyss:  
lustre and purification belong to thee!”

This formula seems to have been repeated frequently, cf. op. cit. p. 346.

<sup>3)</sup> *Mowinkel*, *Psalmstudien* V, pp. 22ff.

<sup>4)</sup> op. cit. – cf. *Oudtest. Studiën* VIII, pp. 85ff.

ness of ritual cleanness and uncleanness. Ezekiel reproaches the priests of his days for their defects in the fulfilment of this duty (22,23, cf. 44,23). Especially must many people have asked for divine guidance concerning conditions excluding them from the service in the temple. It might be problems of race (Deut. 23,4; Ezra 2,63), health or disease (Deut. 23,2, cf. the laws on leprosy, Lev. 13f.), and similar rules of cultic uncleanness connected with sexual life et. al. (Lev. 12 and 15, cf. 1 Sam. 20,26; 21,4ff.). Celebrations of penitential days (Zech. 7,1ff.), and of course also "moral problems", might be difficulties laid before the oracle of the priests. They were in these respects important as the spiritual guides of the people. The laws concerning some of these subjects prove that the priests had a large corpus of traditions as foundation for answering questions of this kind. In the course of time, through centuries of oracular practice, laws had been developed defining proceedings in many cases occurring frequently<sup>1)</sup>. But at all times cases would appear presenting unexperienced problems. Then the oracle had to be consulted and new answers given.

This constitutes the background for the so-called *tōrāh-liturgies*<sup>2)</sup>, e.g. proclaiming conditions for access to the sanctuary<sup>3)</sup>. We have two real examples of such instruction, preserved in liturgical form, Ps. 24, and Ps. 15, where the oracles have become *permanent parts of the liturgy* probably used when processions entered the sacred enclosure. A derivative of this type is the warning-tablet from the temple of Jerusalem, forbidding non-Jews to enter the sacred enclosure. There is nothing astonishing or even scandalous in this fact that oracles in the course of time become permanent parts of liturgy. The aim of liturgy is to repeat and revive the sacred memories of the congregation<sup>4)</sup>. Christian liturgies in many places still repeat the ancient Messianic promises of the OT as true means of edification in the service. – *Prophetic "imitations"* are e.g. Micah 6, 6–8 and Is. 33, 14–16, certainly also Is. 1, 10–17, the threatening introitus of which (v. 10) presumably rests on official introductions of this kind containing, instead of the names of Sodom and Gomorrah, the sacred names of the chosen people. A variety of these liturgies are the *proclamations of the conditions of the covenant* between God and the nation, probably recited

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 214.

<sup>2)</sup> concerning the idea of the *tōrāh* cf. Östborn, *Tōrā in the Old Testament* (1945): Östborn thinks that "directive", "instruction", and "law" are the leading ideas expressed in this word. The assumption that the word is the "imported" word *tertu* is rejected. Cf. further the criticism by Engnell in *Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses VII*, 1946, pp. 1ff.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. above, p. 161f.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. Mowinkel, *Psalmstudien III*, p. 8f.

at the festivals of Yahweh's accession to the throne of the world<sup>1</sup>): Ps. 50, 81, and 95<sup>2</sup>). Derivatives in prose of this type, or perhaps from the liturgies of entry (cf. above) may explain the forms of the *decalogues* and *dodecalogues*<sup>3</sup>), and perhaps also hortatory *sermons* as those of Deut. 1-11 etc.<sup>4</sup>)

Engnell<sup>5</sup>) emphasizes both the point accentuated here, that the law-liturgies are the background of prose sermons e.g. in Deut. and Jer., and also – rightly – that the rules and regulations laid down in priestly *tōrah* are always “ethical”, every religion, and not least a typical “cultic” religion, being always “ethical”, i.e. always claiming not only “external” but also “internal” qualifications.<sup>6</sup>).

### Ordeal.

Another phenomenon contributing to the development of the priestly oracle must have been the *ordeal*, the *divine judgment*. In situations such as that described in Num. 5,11 ff. formulas of curse, even in written form, are mobilized. Persons accused of some crime had to confess their sins in fixed forms (“give glory to the Lord”, cf. Jos. 7,19, cf. the expression in Ps. 32,5, where the word rendered by the A.V. “confess” originally is a terminus of praise), or prove their innocence e.g. by *self-imprecations* (Ps. 7,4f. (A.V.: 7,3f.), where the word “this” points to the “iniquity” not named, cf. 1 Ki. 8,31). Or they had to swear *oaths of purification* (the formula preserved in Ps. 7 and in Job 31). Another form of the ritual is handed down in Deut. 26,13 ff. To all such formulas an *answer* from the oracle through the mediating priest certainly belonged. It may have had some form of benediction or curse, cf. Jos. 7,27, or Jer. 22,27-30. The ritual described in Num. 5,11 ff. of course also gives illustrations of words spoken at an ordeal, but not the final judgment.

### Sermons.

Finally it must be noticed that certain similarities between oracles in Ps. 81 and 95 and the parenetic parts of Deut. and the Code of Holiness seem to prove that this form of literature, also represented in sections of Jer. and Ez., has developed from forms of oracles<sup>7</sup>), perhaps with longer poems like Ps. 78

<sup>1</sup>) Mowinkel, Psalmenstudien II, pp. 150ff.; III, pp. 38ff.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. p. 161f.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. p. 221.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. pp. 206ff.

<sup>5</sup>) Gamla testamentet I, p. 71.

<sup>6</sup>) cf. my Indledning til de gammeltestl. Salmer, p. 115, cf. p. 118.

<sup>7</sup>) cf. above concerning “liturgical *tōrah*.”



or 106 as intermediate link<sup>1</sup>). The form of *sermons* we also know from those prose “*speeches of retirement*”, attributed to great leaders of the nation (Jos. 24,1; 1 Sam. 12; 1 Ki. 2,1–9; 1 Macc. 2,49–69). But *Hylmō* may be right<sup>2</sup>) in assuming that the sermon has other roots than the oracle, e.g. the political speech (Judg. 9), the prophetic speech, and Wisdom literature. The constituting elements in speeches of this kind seem to have been a historical retrospect and an admonition. The style lives on in early Christian literature (Act. 2, Act. 7, and in the speeches of Paul in the second part of Acts<sup>3</sup>). The same arrangement is however found in the liturgical pieces just mentioned, and it is also quite clear in Ps. 78. This speaks for a connection with such liturgies, but other examples warn, as usual, against too strict generalisations.

*Literature:* Kùchler, Das priesterliche Orakel (in the Festschrift für Baudissin). Mowinkel, Psalmenstudien III and V. Hempel, Die israelitischen Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch (ZDMG 1925, pp. 120ff.). Mowinkel, Le Décalogue (1927). Begrich, Das priesterliche Heilsorakel (ZATW 1934, pp. 81ff.). Hempel, RGG, 2nd ed. s. v. Ordal.

## The Prophetic Oracle.

### *Prophets and Prophecy.*

According to the common view the difference between the prophetic and the priestly oracle is mainly marked through the *psychological* character of its bearer<sup>4</sup>). The prophetic oracle originates in a condition of *rapture* analogous to the inspired moments of other fields of spiritual life. But it receives its peculiar colour through the circumstance that the rapture is caused by the hand of God catching hold of the prophet and forcing him to speak the divine messages. This state of rapture, comprehending a wide scale of degrees of strength, is often labelled “*ecstasy*”, or we use the term of Lindblom: *The revelatory state*, describing the specific mental condition of the prophet in his moments of inspiration. Consequently, the prophetic literature is described as a type, known all over the world, especially developed in *mystic circles*, and styled “*revelation literature*”.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. my Die josianische Reform, pp. 97ff. <sup>2</sup>) p. 71.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. the paragraph on speeches of these kinds, below, pp. 206ff.

<sup>4</sup>) The works on the *ecstasy* of the prophets are universally known. We only need to mention the names of Gunkel, Hölscher, and Duhm. The most exhaustive work is Lindblom, Profetismen i Israel (1934), cf. also his article in Studia Theol. I, Riga 1935. Further, cf. Rowley, The nature of Prophecy (cf. above p. 185, n. 4). Guillaume, Prophecy and Divination (1938). – I. Seierstad, Die Offenbarungserlebnisse der Propheten Amos, Jesaja und Jeremia (1946). Widengren, Literary and Psychol. Aspects (1948).

In the moments of *rapture*, either fully developed "ecstasy" or – most frequently – a state of "uplifting of soul" of more or less "normal" clarity of mind, the prophet receives "*visions*" and "*auditions*". Or a thought "comes to him" with such clearness and so *compellingly* that he feels forced to accept it as a word of God to himself which he is obliged to express and give to his environment. Buhl<sup>1)</sup> has drawn attention to the religious experience, "the unmistakable feeling of man when praying, of an answer granting the prayer – a "yea and Amen", as Luther put it – given by a voice which he is able to distinguish clearly from his own", as the most appropriate analogy of the inmost mystery of prophecy which "evades all understanding". Further, we note that there is a truth in Buhl's too summary repudiation of "the narcotically intoxicated Pythia,... the derwishes or.... the hypnotic phenomena" as analogies. Such states of mind and body certainly occur among the prophets, especially among the *nabis* of earlier times, as they are described in Sam. and Kings; but they seem to be of minor importance among the "revolutionary prophets" known from the prophetic books. The *compelling* force is still there. We hear of visions and auditions, calling the prophets to their task. We read passages where it is clear that the prophet is in an excited state of mind, e.g. when Jeremiah screams in the "throes" brought upon him by the hand of God, the pains felt in his "intestines" (4,19, cf. Is. 21,3; Dan. 10,16), or when the prophet speaks of the physical constraint put upon him by the word of God, so that he must speak in spite of himself (20,9, cf. Is. 8,11; cf. also the verb *p'm* Judg. 13,23<sup>2)</sup>).

Auditions and visions are divided into three groups. To the first group belong various kinds of *hallucinations* connected with the field of observation. The second group comprises *apprehensions* showing different degrees of intensity. The third group lies in the field of *thinking* and are not real visions and auditions, but more accurately *intellectual convictions* of *rare acuteness* and overwhelming power, as e.g. the poetical inspiration in its highest degree. Hylmø and others in this last case speak of "revelations" in another meaning than Lindblom, viz. in adhesion to the usage also known in popular speech when people of an experience surprisingly and compellingly "dawning upon them" say that it was "like a revelation". Specific hallucinations are generally not supposed to exist in OT prophecy. But scholars find several examples believed to belong to the second group, generally called "*imaginative*" visions and auditions. The same is the case of the third group, in a more specific sense characterized by the expression preferred by Lindblom: "revelations".

It is certainly necessary to make it plain that the psychological condition of the prophets is not at all so "*abnormal*" as generally supposed. That word can only be used of the very exaggerated cases of ecstasy, which are, however, seldom. I think we have to consider the

<sup>1)</sup> De messianske Forjættelser (1894), p. 91.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. Moore, ad Judg. 3, p. 9.



truth of the words written by an English scholar<sup>1)</sup>: "Probably it is only the sense of personal unworthiness and failure to live in the light of such visions which prevent large numbers of people from speaking of illuminating voices which, were they messages for the world at large and not intensely personal, would justify the exordium of prophecy: "Thus saith the Lord"<sup>2)</sup>. More profound religious experience will be able to explain many things in the prophets which are now called "abnormal".

The material for the study of the OT prophets is in the first line furnished by the *prophetic writings*, collected and preserved first orally, later in written form, by disciples of that series of prophets, beginning with *Amos* in the middle of the 8th century B. C. and ending in the youngest parts of the Dodecaphetion and the book of *Isaiah*. But it is rightly stressed by scholars that *Amos* already represents a fully developed style and accordingly presupposes a long tradition, perhaps extending over centuries<sup>3)</sup>. Prophetic ecstasy is in the documents (1 Sam. 10,10; 19,24) connected with the times of *Samuel*. It is here described as an epidemic, infecting suddenly and violently. In some cases we hear that ecstasy in these circles was produced by means of *music* (2 Ki. 3,15), and that the nabis during the rapture danced and mutilated themselves (the Baal prophets, 1 Ki. 18,26). In 1 Ki. 18,42 *Elijah* seems to prepare ecstasy through the posture of his body. But perhaps his putting his face between his knees, lying upon the earth, is better explained as a common posture of prayer. The essential thing has certainly been the spiritual concentration in prayer<sup>4)</sup>. At the court of *Ahab* we find prophets in crowds (1 Ki. 22). They are also attached to sanctuaries<sup>5)</sup>. *Ahab's* prophets have probably been those of the royal sanctuary (cf. *Amos* 7,13). Is. 28,10 is sometimes understood as an indication of inarticulate cries or disconnected words ejaculated in ecstasy, cf. Is. 8,11; 30,7; Jer. 20,3. In some passages the prophets are called "insane" (2 Ki. 9,11; Hos. 9,7), and Jer. 29,26 informs us that in the sanctuary at Jerusalem a priest had the task to look after the prophets and the insane lest they should cause disturbances: He was authorized to put them in prison and in the stocks. — This *epidemic nabiism* obviously starting about the beginning of the period of the Israelite kingdom is a common Near Eastern phenomenon,

<sup>1)</sup> *Guillaume*, *Prophecy and Divination*, p. 217.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. also *Mowinkel*, *Die Erkenntnis Gottes bei den alttestamentlichen Propheten* (1941), pp. 47ff.

<sup>3)</sup> This evolutionistic view is also represented by *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet I*, p. 73; cf. *Hylmö*, p. 74.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Benzinger*, ad. loc.; *Gressmann*, *SAT II*, 1, 2nd ed. (1921), p. 263; *Duhm* to Is. (4th ed., pp. 64ff.).

<sup>5)</sup> cf. p. 249.



known both in Syria<sup>1)</sup> and Asia Minor, the classical region of ecstasy down to the time of Montanism. But it is purified like many other phenomena through the influence of the religion of Israel and in our "revolutionary prophets" reaches its historical culmination, prepared by the anti-Canaanite prophetic leaders like *Elijah*, cf. Nathan and Micaiah ben Imlah. *Hylmö* rightly underlines that the history of the prophetic oracle has not been determined by the vulgar nabiism of Canaan, but by men who ventured to stand alone against their kings and their people. Their words have been preserved, partly in the collections of their disciples, partly in legends of prophets in the historical books, and only by these means it has been made possible for us to attempt a description of the style of prophetic oracles.

Modern research stresses the *connection of the prophets with the oracle-giving of the sanctuaries* and that of their language with their functions there: It is *cultic language*. Most types, perhaps all, have originally been connected with ritual, as proved by the imitation of liturgies and "symbolical" i.e. ritual acts. – But not all prophets came from the sanctuaries. Some texts from Mari illustrate that oracles came from the people and were brought to the king. In Israel the great example of this is Amos.

*Literature:* The best description of prophecy is given by *Lindblom* in his great work mentioned above p. 191, n. 4; cf. also *Guillaume* (cf. *ibid.*). *Tor Andræ*, *Mystikens psykologi* (1927), *Hölscher*, *Die Propheten* (1914). *Duhm*, *Israels Propheten* (1916). *Skinner*, *Prophecy and Religion* (1926). *Johnson*, *The Cultic Prophet* (1944). *Halder*, *Associations of Cult Prophets* (1945). *Rowley*, cf. above p. 191, n. 4. Conc. the rival prophets, see also *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet I*, p. 75, with the quotations of *Johs. Pedersen*.

See further *Engnell*, in *Religion och Bibel* (1949), *A. Lods* in *Studies ... presented to T. H. Robinson* (1950), pp. 103ff. – *Johs. Pedersen*, *ibid.*, pp. 127ff.; *Noth*, *Gotteswort u. Gesch. im AT* (1949), pp. 12ff.; and my paper in *Norsk Teol. Tidsskr.* 1951, pp. 209ff. – Cf. also II, p. 102 on the relation between the prophetic *sheikh* and his "congregation".

In connection with an examination of the forms of prophetic literature we need not pay much attention to questions of *authenticity* of the oracles ascribed to the different prophetic persons.

### *The Style of the Prophetic Oracle.*

As mentioned before, the prophetic oracle is stamped by its psychological presuppositions. It is therefore appropriate to speak of its *ecstatic style*, the style of revelation. Rapture does not take its hand off the prophet until the word has been spoken (Amos 3,8; Jer. 20,9). The style is not quiet, the speech is not advancing calmly, on the contrary, the pictures chase one another, the language

<sup>1)</sup> cf. the example from *Byblos* from the 11th century, alluded to in the narrative of the journey of Wen-Amun, see e.g. the translation in *Barton*, *Archaeology and the Bible*, p. 449: "The god seized one of his (i.e. the king of Byblos) noble youths, making him frenzied, so that he said ..."

is often rough, with abrupt transitions e.g. from the "I" of the human bearer of the divine word to the "I" of the divine author, with grammatical incongruities which must not tempt us into the slippery road of textual emendations<sup>1</sup>). Nevertheless, the ecstatic oracles are very often *poetry* of the highest rank. As example is universally mentioned the pathetic description of the Day of Judgment on Israel in *Jer.* 4,19–29. The poem begins with the *cry* expressing the physical pain felt by the prophet during the ecstatic experience<sup>2</sup>). Then follows the *audition* (v. 19b–20), but the last sentence seems to indicate transition from audition to vision: He watches the storm on the camp and the looting, and prays God in words borrowed from the psalms of lamentation<sup>3</sup>) to rid him of the vision, so dreadful to the ardent patriot. Characteristic of the ecstatic style is then v. 22 with its transition from speech of the prophet to a speech by Yahweh himself, describing the reasons for the disaster: The people has not got the true wisdom. Then follows a great vision, the culmination of the revelation (v. 23–26): The prophet discovers that Yahweh has annihilated the world. The primeval *tohuwabohu* (v. 23, cf. *Gen.* 1,2) has come back. Then in v. 27–28, like v. 22, a word of God is interposed, giving the cause of the desolation. And after that the poem proceeds with both visionary and auditory elements.<sup>4</sup>)

The prophetic books are rich in poems similar to this, and often of still higher aesthetic value. *Hylmö* says that their visionary parts often have the sensual intensity of hallucinations, combined with a rich lyric form, but also with a dramatic power witnessing to the tension in the soul of the prophet<sup>5</sup>). As other brilliant examples he quotes *Is.* 63,1–6 and the poem of the sword of

<sup>1</sup>) This is no recently won understanding, as seems implied by *Engnell's* note, *Gamla testamentet* I, p. 78, n. 1: My words quoted with approval by the Swedish author, as everybody should know rest on the view set forth many years ago by *Lindblom* (*Die literarische Gattung der prophetischen Literatur* (1924), and his analyses of some of the prophetic books (cf. the summary of literature at the end of this chapter). – In Danish OT literature we have always been very sceptical towards the tendency to emendation of the text, so marked in German literature at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th. Our translation of the OT from 1931 is a deplorable exception to the rule. The magnificent book of *Nyberg*, *Studien zum Hoseabuche*, has therefore not brought us into new positions, but we welcome it as a sound reaction against phenomena towards which we too have been critical.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. above, p. 192. <sup>3</sup>) cf. p. 164.

<sup>4</sup>) concerning the text cf. the commentaries which often go too far in emendations.

<sup>5</sup>) *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet* I, p. 78, rightly notes that it is difficult to decide what is real experience and what is merely form and style, but also that the two do not exclude one another. – Originally such descriptions of coming events (cf. e.g. *Is.* 13) are related to *incantations*, conjuring up weal or woe.

Yahweh in Ez. 21,14–22. We could also remind readers of Habakkuk and Is. 21,1–10, or Nahum.

Often the prophetic utterances are characterized by a certain *mysteriousness*, e.g. when Isaiah links his preaching to mysterious *names* (8,1ff. cf. 30,7, and the son named in 7,3). Such single words are perhaps the only sounds which he is able to remember from the moments of rapture. But we must warn against an over-stressing of the ecstatic element. It may have happened on one of the more “normal” levels of the revelatory state of mind, that such phrases fasten in the thoughts of men. This points to a circumstance, certainly to be considered a fact, that in many cases it is not the elaborate form of the oracle now lying before us which expresses the original experience, but rather one single, ponderous sentence, e.g. the watchword-like, proverbial utterances in Is. 7, 9b or 28,16: Here we perceive the relationship between the *māšāl* of prophets and sages, e.g. also in the assonances of the former of these two passages. In the same way we must also explain the *allegorical names* from Hos. 1, Is. 7,3; 7,14; 8,1; Jer. 20,3, or *mysterious expressions*, having perhaps an explanation in mythological ideas, e.g. the “Virgin” (Is. 7,14), “she which travaileth” (Micah 5,2)<sup>1</sup>), while others have been formed according to older descriptions, e.g. of the armies of Asshur and Babel, and then “eschatologized” into symbols of the world power fighting against God, e.g. “the Northern” (Joel 2,20<sup>2</sup>). This especially is going on in the description, given by Ezekiel and later prophets, of the last great assault of the heathen nations against the Holy City.

This last example shows us another characteristic in the style of the prophetic oracle, connected with its mysterious clairoboscure. Jeremiah had spoken of an “enemy from the North”, probably meaning the Babylonians<sup>3</sup>). Upon the whole it is not common that the nation used by Yahweh to castigate Israel is directly mentioned by name. It may of course happen, especially when judgment is preached against the foe of God, e.g. in the anti-Assyrian oracles of Isaiah (10,5ff.). But generally the prophets use *poetical circumlocutions*, cf. Nah. 3,1; Is. 22,18; Jer. 6,22; 10,22; Zech. 2,6; Micah 5,6. This may be stylistic mannerism, like the circumlocutions of Nordic bard poetry. But it is certainly

<sup>1</sup>) cf. already Hempel, *Die althebräische Literatur*, p. 134, n. 2, cf. p. 137. Ample illustrations are furnished by the texts from *Ras Šaīma* (the text Nikal-Kōtarōt, lin. 6), cf. Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship*, pp. 132ff.; C. B. Hansen, in *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 1940, p. 47, and now *Hammershaimb*, *ibid.* 1946.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. Robinson's commentary in *Eissfeldt's Handbuch zum AT* and the literature quoted there.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. vol. II. I do not accept the widespread Scythian theory. The description is not explicit enough.



a fact that this manner of speaking is in agreement with the nature of prophetic experience, its contact with a profound mystery.

The prophetic oracle also possesses certain *syntactical* peculiarities. Most important is the so-called "*perfectum propheticum*". It is a form of speech certainly also occurring in prose texts as an expression of coming events as real to the speaker as if they had already happened. The old grammarians called this form the "*perfectum confidentiae*"<sup>1)</sup>. It must be remembered, of course, that modern Hebrew philology has recognized that we cannot speak of *tempora* in Hebrew in the same manner as in the classical grammar<sup>2)</sup>. But nevertheless *Hylmö*<sup>3)</sup> seems to be right in pointing out that the use of perfect indicative, especially when followed by a consecutive imperfect, is a remarkable stylistic form in prophetic predictions, probably explained by the fact that the prophets in their revelatory state are living so intensely in the coming events that they perceive them as already fulfilled. The prophetic oracle is a vision of the great acts of Yahweh and therefore possesses the power of creating the future (cf. Ps. 33,9). The difficulties of translation cannot be handled here, but the reader must be referred to commentaries. We cannot nowadays speak of a "prophetic perfect" in the sense of the older grammarians; but this emphatic perfect is none the less a characteristic element of prophetic style, and the old term "prophetic perfect" is therefore no bad term, if only we know what we mean.

It has also been observed that the oracles of the prophets show an inclination to group *questions*. It is however not certain that this has anything to do with ecstasy. It may be poetical or rhetorical form. It also occurs in a psalm (114,5f.) where commentators however have drawn attention to the almost visionary character of the passage. Such questions in poetical contexts are naturally always expressions of the intensity with which the bard or the prophet takes part in his visionary impressions. He does not understand at once why this or that happens, and therefore he addresses what he sees before him and puts his question to it (Zech. 2,6; cf. 4,4). Very frequently Yahweh or his representatives put questions to the prophet, e.g. to call his attention to the object which he wants him to see (Amos 7,8; 8,2; Jer. 1,11, 13; Zech. 4,2, 5; 5,2).

Sometimes we meet a group of *imperatives*. It looks as if the prophet addresses *invisible beings*<sup>4)</sup>. I cannot help assuming that in such cases we have the form of the *incantation song* taken up by the prophet<sup>5)</sup>, see e.g. the two examples

<sup>1)</sup> Johs. Pedersen, *Israel I-II*, p. 145.

<sup>2)</sup> id. *Hebræisk Grammatik* § 119a, cf. *Israel*, p. 114.

<sup>3)</sup> *Hylmö*, p. 8. – cf. *Birkeland*, *Lærebok i Hebraisk Grammatikk* (1947, § 651).

<sup>4)</sup> *Hylmö*, p. 83.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. p. 125.

adduced by *Hylmö*, Is. 8, 9-10 and Micah 1,2-7. That groupings of this kind are "ecstatic" cannot be called certain.

Finally we have to notice that the prophetic oracle like other types of literature has its specific *formulas* characterizing it as a word of Yahweh, i.e. the well-known phrases "Thus saith the Lord" – at the beginning – or *ne'um Yahweh*, "oracle of Yahweh" – most frequently at the end, or in the middle, of the oracle, sometimes at the beginning, and sometimes not with Yahweh, but the seer as subject. These formulas can be varied in different ways in poetical contexts. The probability must however be taken into consideration that these formulas are common to both priestly and prophetic oracles. But especially the latter seems to indicate something like inspiration and so might be especially connected with prophets. But they certainly, as formulae, are elements of ritual language.

#### *Other Prophetic Types.*

In the oracle proper the prophet is strictly bound to the contents and mostly to the form of the message received. To be sure we have previously alluded to factors indicating that an oracle may be formed round the original, watchword-like oracular sentence as its nucleus or its culmination. This further applies to such prophetic poems treating the subject in "foreign styles" e.g. love song, taunting song, funeral dirge, or forms of psalms or the Wisdom literature or the letter.

But the prophets do not limit themselves to predictions of the future, to the mediating of oracles. They make good their oracles of doom by means of *ethically motivated speeches of reproach*. They admonish the people to evade impending judgment by a conversion before it is too late. They proclaim what the people must believe and do if it wants to show true conversion. They speak consolation to the desponding and dejected people. In short, they are not only oracle-givers, but preachers and spiritual guides.

#### *Speeches of Reproach.*

German scholars talk of a "Gattung" called "*Strafrede*". This means a prophetic utterance, *reproaching* the congregation or individuals for sins committed against God and men. By description of the sin the prophets give proofs of the necessity of punishment, sometimes described in a following oracle of doom. The speeches of reproach *accuse* the people, and the following oracle draws the consequence and pronounces the divine sentence.

Typical are the speeches at the opening of the book of *Amos*. The speech of



reproach is here quite regularly built up. First an enumeration of the sins, introduced by the word 'al, "for", then comes the oracle of doom, in perfect consecutive. Of course the speech, and not only the speech of reproach, can be developed still more. The opening chapters of Amos prove that the prophets could form a greater composition by linking a series of oracles together. The same result is reached by combining a series of curses, introduced by "Woe!", or by joining oracles to one another by means of a refrain (Is. 5,8ff.; 9,7-20 + 5,25-29(30?)). In later sermons similar phenomena occur (Zech. 7-8).

The speech may be introduced by an *appeal* to listen and by *vocatives* naming the public addressed, either in neutral form or in words already announcing the reproach, cf. Amos 8,4. When Amos (4,1) addresses the women of Samaria as "kine of Bashan" I do not think this a taunting address<sup>1</sup>). It is rather a *captatio benevolentiae*, "kine of Bashan" being cattle of fine breed<sup>2</sup>). The prophet here, as in 3,1, wins the attention of his public through a compliment and then afterwards hits at their iniquity with the more vehemence<sup>3</sup>). — Speeches of reproach may also be introduced by the word "Woe!", otherwise the exordium of curses. So the speech Is. 1,4-9 starts with a *curse* followed by a description of the sins giving reasons for the curse (v. 4), but then the reproach in v. 5 is changed to a question, pitying the plight of the land in an unsentimental, slightly humorous tone: On which part of your body have you room for more lashes of the whip? — i.e. rather an *admonition* not to expose the body bleeding from innumerable wounds to further blows, cf. the same form in Jer. 22,13-19; Amos 6,1ff.; Hab. 2,6ff.

The *oracle of doom* following the speech of reproach is generally introduced by a "therefore" (*lākēn*). But sometimes the order is inversed. A variety of this latter form is that the description of judgment ends with a question: Why has this happened? followed by the speech of reproach answering the question (Is. 23,6ff.; Jer. 13,18-22 — *Hylmō*).

Speeches of reproach also are given *without an oracle* of doom attached to them. This is no wonder when the speech has been introduced by "woe!", this word in itself being an oracle of doom. Other speeches take the form of a regular *lawsuit* between Yahweh and his unfaithful people (Is. 1,2f.; 3,12-15; Jer. 2,4-9, 10-13; Micah 6, 1-8). In speeches of this kind Yahweh does not occupy the seat of the judge, but stands as one of the contesting parties, while as judges

<sup>1</sup>) *Hylmō* with reference to Bauer, Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken 1925-26, p. 437.

<sup>2</sup>) Robinson, in his commentary in *Eissfeldt's Handbuch*, who however also thinks of mockery.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. now *Hammershaimb*, ad loc.



are named heaven and earth, the mountains, the foundations of the earth etc. In this lawsuit then the speech of reproach is presented as speech of accusation.

This form of speech has undergone a peculiar transformation in *Deutero-Isaiah*. His task being to proclaim the *salvation* of the people his speeches of reproach are combined with *oracles of weal*, not of woe. The reproaches can be directed against the sins of the people in the past (Is. 43,22ff.). But he also accuses the people of doubting Yahweh's will and power to save, and then oracles of salvation are promulgated to maintain Yahweh's will to save in spite of everything (Is. 45,9-13; cf. 58,1-12; 59,1-4). In Malachi the speech of reproach generally starts in the form of a *discussion*, the accusation of the prophet being questioned by the hearers, and their objection in turn being opposed by a refutation from the prophet.

### *The Admonition.*

We have seen that the speech of reproach in Is. 1,4ff. seemed to assume the character of admonition. The prophets have used the reproaches to awaken the people to *conversion* in order to avoid the impending doom. This especially appears in so-called *speeches of admonition* ("Mahnreden"), e.g. Amos 5,14-15. — We have also noted<sup>1)</sup> that speeches of admonition must have some connection with *oracles of cultic functionaries* in certain liturgical combinations. Here the speech is aimed at the education of the people to keep the commandments of God.

While the speech of reproach gives reasons for the doom the admonition proclaims the *conditions of salvation*<sup>2)</sup>, classically expressed in the watchword of Isaiah 7,9. The passage of which this line forms the conclusion is a good description of the place in life of the speech of admonition, and we have also here a characteristic word of introduction to an admonitory speech, the niphal form of *šmr*, "take heed". In Jer. too we have many admonitory speeches.

The admonition may be combined with *oracles of woe* (Amos 5,4-6; Is. 30,15; Jer. 4,3f.; 13,15-17; 21,1ff.; Ez. 18,30), but also with oracles of *weal* (Amos 5,14f.; Hos. 14,2-10; Jer. 3,13; 4,1f.; 7,3-7; 26,3). This follows from its character of proclamation of conditions for salvation. Is. 1,18-20 is no speech of admonition. Therefore *Hylmö's* ingenious assumption that admonition is here combined with both doom and salvation is not correct<sup>3)</sup>. The passage is

<sup>1)</sup> cf. the liturgical *tōrah* pp. 188ff.

<sup>2)</sup> *Hylmö*, p. 91.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 93, cf. *Engnell*, Gamle testamentet I, p. 82 and several commentaries. In my commentary I follow the opposition of *Buhl's* interpretation against this misunderstanding of the context.

most probably a call to appear before the judgment-seat, and therefore an accusation of the kind describing Yahweh engaged in a lawsuit against his people (cf. above, p. 199f). On the other hand, *Hylmö* may be right in quoting Is. 28,16–22 and Zeph. 2,1–3 as examples. In Is. 44,21–23 the admonition is combined with a *hymn*. Even in Amos the admonition must exhibit a somewhat hopeful outlook (“perhaps”, 5,15): It is not yet too late, but it may soon be too late! This element is also found in the conclusion of the cultic oracle of Ps. 2.

The *form* of the speeches of admonition is marked by their *conditional* character, Is. 7,9, cf. 30,15–17. On the other hand the hypothetic particle of Is. 1,19 must not mislead us into finding a speech of admonition here, for the whole context is threatening<sup>1)</sup>, and accordingly we must here have a proclamation of doom or a speech of reproach. It is supposed that the people in the coming lawsuit will be accused of being polluted with sins as red as blood and purple, and of obstinacy and disobedience. – The conditional clause can be replaced by an imperative with following expressions of the consequences of obedience to the commandment (Amos 5,4).

The *imperative* form is predominant in the speech of admonition without an oracle joined to it. *Hylmö* here finds an inheritance from the ancient style of oracles, cf. also the categorical style in the laws<sup>2)</sup>.

### *Prophetic tōrāh.*

Like the priests the prophets use the form of proclaiming the commandments of Yahweh to his people and its individual members. We have seen that among the priests this leads to the development of the so-called *tōrāh-liturgy*<sup>3)</sup>. This form also occurs among the prophets. In pure form we find it e.g. Is. 1, 10–17, cf. also Micah 6, 6–8; Is. 56,1–8; Zech. 7,1–7. Is 58 is from beginning to end a parallel to the best example of the liturgical type, Ps. 50<sup>4)</sup>. In Amos 5, 18–27 this form is remodelled as a combined speech of reproach and admonition, while it seems again to appear in pure form in Jer. 6,16–20 and 7,21.

Accordingly, this type can be used independently, but it may also, e.g. in Hos. 6,4–6, be combined with a speech of reproach, cf. Is. 58,1–7. It may change to historical argument as in Jer. 7,22, and be influenced by the admoni-

<sup>1)</sup> I refer to my commentary, against the article of *Sjöberg*, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1947, pp. 309ff. <sup>2)</sup> p. 224f. <sup>3)</sup> cf. pp. 188ff. – The prophetic *torah*-liturgy is in itself of ritual origin.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. p. 160f.

tions, cf. Jer. 7,23 and Amos 5,18–27, were the reproach also plays its part. Above all it has affinities with the style of the laws, and here we meet both the hypothetical and the categorical form of law<sup>1)</sup>. The hypothetical form we find in Hag. 2,12f. and Jer. 3,1, cf. the great treatise on retribution in Ez. 18. Peculiar hypothetical forms are pointed out by *Hylmö*<sup>2)</sup>: Is. 58,6ff. and 66,3. Especially is the latter passage with its asyndetical combination of participles very effective. The categorical style of law we find in imperative form or in the infinitive absolutus (Amos 5,23; Is. 1,17; 56,1; Jer. 7,21; Zech. 8,16; 8,19; Is. 58,7).

Upon the whole it must be noticed that the prophets, also outside such liturgies and imitations of liturgies, use *other literary types*, e.g. the *funeral dirge* (Amos 5; Is. 14,4–23 – here in a mocking form, cf. above p. 138) and the *love song* (e.g. Is. 5,1–ff., cf. above p. 132), *drinking songs etc.* (cf. pp. 127f.). It is not a matter of course that such usage should not have been common in connection with rites. The so-called “symbolical acts” of the prophets may very well reflect an earlier use in magic and ritual. 1 Kings 22 describes part of a ritual act of “sanctifying war”, and 1 King 18 a competition between “rain-makers”, but not in the magic sphere: Both chapters reflect the conflict of two religions.

*Literature:* Lindblom, Die literarische Gattung der prophetischen Literatur (1924), with an examination of the book of Amos; Hosea literarisch untersucht (1927); Micha literarisch untersucht (1928); Die Gesichte der Propheten (Studia Theologica I, Riga 1935); *Hylmö*, Studier över stilen i de gammaltestamentliga profetböckerna I (1929). Beyer, Spruch und Predigt bei den vorexilischen Schriftpropheten (1933). Hempel, Althebräische Literatur, pp. 56–73. Eissfeldt, Einleitung, pp. 82ff. Mowinkel, Motiver og stilformer i profeten Jeremias diktning (Edda 1926). Morbeck, Profeten Jesaja, stil och äkthet (1927). L. Köhler, Deuterorjesaja stilkritisch untersucht (1923). Glahn und Köhler, Der Prophet der Heimkehr (1934) II.

On *visions* and other *narratives* in the prophetic books, cf. p. 246 and 257; concerning *prose sermons*, cf. 207ff.

Cf. further my paper on Amos 1–2 in Oudtestamentische Studiën VIII (1950). – Sjöberg, in Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 1949. – A full review of recent literature by Eissfeldt in The OT and Modern Study, pp. 115ff.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. pp. 224ff.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 99.



## PROSE

### *Introductory.*

The prose literature of the OT is represented by a series of categories, arranged by *Eissfeldt* under three headings: *Speeches*, *documents*, and *narratives*. *Eissfeldt* takes all three terms in their broadest meaning, "speeches" comprehending both sermons and prose prayers, and "documents" also "many forms which above all are used in oral communication such as reports and formulas of messengers" ("Botensprüche"), e.g. also *laws*.

This arrangement easily becomes somewhat artificial. Especially is the group "*documents*" not clearly defined. Everything may be called a "document", so far as it is a "historical document". If this group is to be defined clearly, the word must be reserved for "documents" properly speaking, i.e. *letters* and *contracts*, perhaps also *lists* (genealogies, descriptions of frontiers etc.), while even *laws* must be kept apart as a distinct type. I should prefer to give *letters* a place of their own. Further, the group "*speeches*" is not very convenient, because this term is used also in poetry as soon as e.g. a prophet combines a series of oracles to form a greater whole, cf. Amos 1-2. And finally we have seen that some prose categories, the *sermon* and the *prose prayer*, are closely related to corresponding poetical types.

Therefore it is certainly more appropriate to introduce a more differentiated register. Especially are the laws so independent stylistically that they must be arranged as a special category. On the other hand, in spite of the difficulties already mentioned, I think it impossible to avoid the prose category of "speeches".

### *Speeches.*

We know that Ancient Israel like all other people has known the power of speech and therefore appreciated the *art* of speaking.

In the books of the prophets and other poetical books, but in the prose books too, we find traces of talent for choosing one's words and arranging the sections of the speech in proper order. The orator begins by an *appeal*, calling

upon the people to assemble around him. He *commands silence* and asks for *attention*, names those to whom his speech is directed (*address*), and draws attention to the importance of his subject (*recommendation*). Thus we learn how a speech was introduced. In some places we also perceive how it was concluded<sup>1</sup>). The aim of the Wisdom literature is among other things to teach men to speak in proper forms and manners, and wisely.

Of David we hear (1 Sam. 16,18) that he was "prudent in speech", *nēbōn dābār*. Moses and Jeremiah attempt to evade their calling by appealing to their not being "men of words", their "not understanding to speak" (Ex. 4,10-16; Jer. 1,6). Moses gets his brother as his assistant, Aaron being one capable of speaking; and Jeremiah has his mouth changed through the touch of Yahweh's hand (1,9). Joab once uses a prudent woman to persuade David (2 Sam. 14, 1-24), and a town is saved from distress by the words of another clever woman (2 Sam. 20,14-22). Abigail knows how to turn her words and join them to a well-conceived action and succeeds in preventing David from committing an evil act (1 Sam. 25). When the serpent in Gen. 3 is described as more cunning than other animals on earth it was because it had talent to speak words which could beguile others, and the narrative then in a masterly way illustrates this, so that we must hail the story-teller, the Yahwist, as a *nēbōn dābār*.

It is important to make clear to ourselves that the OT orators – and this concerns the poetical speeches of the prophets already mentioned as well as Wisdom poetry – aim at other results than speeches generally do in Western Europe. *Johs. Pedersen*<sup>2</sup>) tells us that Israelite thought is generally dominated by a striving after totality and movement. "This characterizes the Hebrew manner of argumentation. We try to persuade by means of abstract reasoning, the Hebrew by directly influencing the will. In expressing a thought he makes the souls of his listeners receive his mind-image, and thus the matter itself; but at the same time he produces an effect by the feeling and will which he puts into his words. His argumentation therefore consists in assurance and repetition. The "parallelismus membrorum" has become his natural manner, the result of which is a totality with a double accent . . .". "When modern logicians have characterized the correct manner of thinking as an interplay of simple, i.e. essentially empty but sharply defined space images, then we see at once the contrast between this and the Israelite ideal of thinking. The Israelite does not occupy himself with empty or with sharply defined space images. His logic is not the logic of abstraction, but of immediate perception".

There is something of the *incantation*, a spell, in all OT speech. It has been

<sup>1</sup>) For particulars, see the paper of *Lindblom*, mentioned below.

<sup>2</sup>) *Israel I-II*, pp. 123-214.

characterized by *Lindblom* most eminently<sup>1)</sup>. "Nous cherchons, dans un débat, à nous persuader mutuellement à l'aide d'arguments réels ou logiques, en Orient on cherche à se convaincre l'un l'autre par la force qu'on peut apporter à ses paroles. Nous nous servons de preuves théoriques ou de faits positifs. Pour l'oriental, la discussion est une affaire de pur dynamisme. Pour lui, il s'agit d'employer la plus grande énergie possible, d'exciter le plus grand enthousiasme possible. Chez nous, remporte la victoire celui qui apporte les meilleurs arguments. En Orient, triomphe celui qui peut mettre dans ses paroles la plus grande quantité de force. Pour nous la vérité est liée à l'existence de normes et de faits objectifs. En Orient, la vérité est plus subjective. Pour l'oriental une affirmation est vraie quand il y croit fermement, quand il y met son âme et quand elle jaillit d'une ferme certitude intérieure. La langue hébraïque emploie le même mot pour "vérité", "véracité" et "fermeté". Lorsque nous trouvons dans l'Ancien Testament quelqu'un désireux de persuader une autre personne, nous le voyons tenter d'y parvenir en donnant à ses paroles une force et un poids personnels auxquels l'autre finit par ne plus pouvoir résister. Il parvient à ce résultat en employant simultanément la force suggestive de l'expression elle-même et la répétition infatigable des idées et des mots. Pour celui qui veut gagner un autre à sa conviction, il est donc nécessaire d'inventer des paroles expressives, frappantes, plastiques, fascinantes, et il lui faut mettre en oeuvre une persistance susceptible d'agir sur l'esprit de l'autre, en l'épuisant et en lui faisant renoncer à continuer à garder son opinion personnelle".

If these methods are used by people, not belonging to the same cultural level as Israel, it will lead to phenomena which we Western people do not like. We have got our methods of thinking and of argumentation from Greece and Rome. But behind the Oriental ideas of rhetorics lies the positive faith in the ability of truth, immediately and through its own inherent force, to convince, pointing back to the great contrast in the world of Israel, truth and blessing, lie and curse.

The following paragraphs – like so many previous paragraphs – follow the scheme usually presented, as mentioned, only a little more differentiated. It must however be noticed, that when we speak of "political speech" etc. the formal classification or the types is abandoned for other criteria, drawn from the contents of the pieces of literature or from their place in life. The forms in many cases are much the same. But as will be seen there are differences. In this field too, new examinations are needed, but it will best be done in monographs. The handbook sticks to the usual order and points to areas where new work must be done.

<sup>1)</sup> Boken om Job, p. 73, cf. La composition du livre de Job, p. 40f.



### *Political Speeches.*

Political speeches are not found in so great a quantity in the OT as e.g. in Greek and Roman literature. But that speeches deserving this name have been delivered is a natural fact. The place in life of the political speech was there. A situation like that leading to the disruption of the kingdom of David and Solomon (1 Ki. 12) has not been without long discussions and ardent speeches, of which we have only short reports in v. 3ff. When the king sent his minister of state to the assembly of the people it must have been with the purpose that the minister should speak to them and make them accept the king. In 1 Sam. 22,6ff. we get a short report of a speech made by the king to his men in solemn assembly. Judg. 5,15bff. deride the long palavers of the Reubenites which made them betray the cause of Israel in time of trouble. The speech of *Jotham* (Judg. 9,7–20), combined with his well-known fable, is an example of political speech. That v. 17–19 perhaps is a younger addition does not mean anything in our treatment of it where we are only studying the forms of speeches. Political *speeches of propaganda* we also meet in the orations of the Assyrian officer 2 Ki. 18,19ff. and 28ff. Both have a mark of the “style of messages” well in accord with the situation: the man is the messenger of his king.<sup>1)</sup> Of the same kind are the speeches made by army leaders to their troops before battle. From OT times we have only a few hints left in 2 Sam. 10,12 and 2 Chron. 20,2. But from later periods we have a little more preserved (1 Macc. 9,8; 10,44–46, and 13,2–6). The situation described in Deut. 20,5–8, where certain officials before the army proceeds to war are directed to call upon everybody who has built a house, but not consecrated it, or planted a vineyard, but not yet reaped, or engaged himself to a woman but not yet married her, and all who are afraid and without courage, to go home, most probably belongs to the rituals, like Deut. 26,5ff. and 13ff., and perhaps we have here a transformation of older poetical forms<sup>2)</sup>. – Before the battle it was customary to address the enemy and advise him not to engage himself in a hopeless struggle (2 Chron. 13, 4–12; 2 Sam. 2,25–26): but this is perhaps a development of the curses hurled against the foe before the battle (cf. p. 140).

The longest speeches, which may be styled “political”, of OT prose, are the so-called “farewell-speeches”, ascribed to several of Israel’s great leaders before their death. When *Eissfeldt*<sup>3)</sup> labels them *political* speeches it does not seem quite appropriate. Most of them have a distinct appearance of being

<sup>1)</sup> cf. the Lachish Letters, *Hempel*, ZATW 1938, p. 131f.

<sup>2)</sup> Conc. the realism of the regulations, cf. my *Die Josianische Reform*, p. 51.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 13f.

*sermons*<sup>1)</sup>, and we have already seen that this form, to be examined again in the next paragraph, probably has a long pedigree leading back to poetry, viz. the oracle, both the priestly and the prophetic admonitions may be poetical links in their genealogy.<sup>2)</sup> *Hylmö*<sup>3)</sup> has, further, pointed to Wisdom literature. Examples of these speeches are Jos. 24, and the somewhat younger parallel in Jos. 23, cf. 1 Sam. 12; 1 Ki. 2, 1-9; 1 Macc. 2, 29-69. Deuteronomy is composed as a farewell-speech of Moses. Some of them (Jos. 23 and 1 Sam. 12) contain the feature that the retiring leader protests that he has done his duty, cf. also the similar speech of Paul in Act. 20.

### *Sermons.*

As just mentioned we have also in the case of the sermon the right to suppose a *poetical past*. At any rate it seems to be a relatively young type among prose categories. *Eissfeldt*<sup>4)</sup> is justified in referring to the circumstance that the prose sermon occurs as a dominating feature only in the younger prophetic books (Jer. and Ez.). Even if these prose sermons hardly belong entirely to the prophets in question<sup>5)</sup>, this circumstance at any rate proves that the form is young. This is confirmed by the third book in which it is dominating, viz. Deuteronomy. The style of these prophetic books is in their prose sections distinctly related to Deut. and also, in the case of Ez., to the so-called *ph*, "the Code of Holiness", in Lev. 17-26. When such features occur in younger prophetic books (cf. also the prose of Haggai and Zechariah 1-8) it certainly has as its explanation the fact that the age from the 7th century and onwards especially has developed this form<sup>6)</sup>: This excited time, with its cult-political reforms (Hezekiah and Josiah), arousing opposition and as a consequence creating propaganda, has contributed largely to a transformation of the old poetical, priestly and prophetic types. They were influenced by the *political* speech, and from this union sprang the *prose parenetic sermon*.

The prophetic speeches of reproach and admonition sometimes have the same character of *historical retrospective* characteristic of these sermons, cf. e.g. Amos 2, 10ff.; 4, 6ff.; Hos. 9, 10-13 and 15, cf. above<sup>7)</sup>. But moreover we

<sup>1)</sup> above, p. 191.

<sup>2)</sup> above, pp. 188ff., 200ff.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 71.

<sup>4)</sup> p. 16.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. II.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. Die josianische Reform, pp. 95-107, *Eissfeldt*, p. 17.

<sup>7)</sup> pp. 198ff.

must put the question, is it not significant that this form is especially found in books ascribed to *prophets of priestly descent* (Jer., Ez., Zech.)?

The influence of *Wisdom literature* in this field is also rather late. As long as it guarded its poetical form<sup>1)</sup> the homiletic character of the contents could not alter the form. Even Wisd. I, 1-5, 23 is still one of the longer poems of later Wisdom literature<sup>2)</sup>. Only the complete disappearance of the sentential form transforms pieces of this kind into pure sermons. A poetical example perhaps is the *Song of Moses* (Deut. 32), as type related to cult-prophetic admonitions from the liturgies of renewal of the covenant<sup>3)</sup>. Its strongly mixed style (Wisdom-style, prophetic sermon and parenetic meditation on history) speaks strongly in favour of the assumption that it is a comparatively late (exilic?) specimen, in a curious manner a sort of "missing link" between the prophetic admonitions and the prosaic exhortations. – Whether *Hellenistic* influence is in action in later days *Eissfeldt*<sup>4)</sup> rightly considers of minor importance, the disappearance of the form of verse being the decisive point. An example of this very young sermon is 4 Macc.<sup>5)</sup>, where the influence of the Hellenistic *diatribe* is manifest. More related to Wisdom literature are the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs<sup>6)</sup>.

We perceive, accordingly, that the sermon as a type really represents a *mixture of types*, characteristic of the younger periods of the history of Israel's literature. A similar mixture can also be observed in most of the *prose prayers* contained in the OT. In many of them their descent from the cult psalms can be clearly seen<sup>7)</sup>. But a prayer such as that of *Ezra* (Ezra 9) has just as much the character of a political propaganda speech. *Eissfeldt*<sup>8)</sup> points to the prayer of Samson (Judg. 16, 28) as an example, where we have a series of features pointing to the arrangement of sections in psalms of lamentation<sup>9)</sup>. The prayer of Joshua (Jos. 7, 7-9) is a regular psalm of penitence translated into prose. In post-exilic prayers, like 2 Chron. 20, 6-12; 3 Macc. 6, 2-15; Judith 9, the Additions to Esther, we find the same ingredients. But when *Eissfeldt* stresses that they become more rich in words, because the divine predicates are massed in strength and e.g. the notion of the Creator is underlined, then this

1) cf. p. 181.

2) cf. above, p. 176 and II.

3) cf. above, p. 160.

4) p. 18.

5) cf. II.

6) cf. II.

7) cf. p. 162.

8) p. 19.

9) cf. pp. 154ff.



means that the *hymn* – as can be clearly observed in the canonical psalms – more markedly influences the psalm of lamentation in the parts suited for such influence, especially the introitus and the final part, and corresponding parts of the corpus (see e.g. 3 Macc. 2,2–3; Judith 9,12). Further the *historical retrospects* play a greater part (3 Macc. 6,4–8; cf. 2 Chron. 20,7; Judith 9,2–4). This especially takes place in prayers of penitence (Ezra 9,7; Neh. 9,6ff.; 3 Macc. 2,3–8; Bar. 1,19–2,10). Here we see a connection with the sermons, perhaps pointing back to poems like Ps. 78 and 106, which are only more elaborate forms of the cultic admonition, known from liturgical oracles like Ps. 81,6bff. and 95,7bff.<sup>1)</sup> As just mentioned the Song of Moses belongs to this complex.

In the Deuteronomistic *prayer of Solomon* (1 Ki. 8,23–53) we encounter a *casuistic* style, enumerating all the instances of calamity in which Israel may seek Yahweh in the temple. Here too, therefore, we see an analogy to the *casuistic* style of the laws<sup>2)</sup>, with the effect that the prayer nearly becomes a cultic law regulating the relations between Yahweh and his people: Here too we therefore see the mixture of types of later ages in full flower.

*Literature:* Lindblom, Det offentliga talet i det gamla Israel, in Studier tilegnede Frants Buhl (1925), pp. 112–119. My Die josianische Reform (1926), pp. 95–107. Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, pp. 226 ss. Wendel, Das freie Laiengebet im vorexilischen Israel (1932). Gunkel, Einleitung in die Psalmen (1933), p. 7.

### Documents.

Dispersed among the literature of the ancient Orient known to us through the deciphering of the old systems of writing, above all the hieroglyphs and the cuneiform script, we every now and then come upon *contracts* of different sorts. In Israelite-Jewish milieu outside the OT we also meet them, e.g. in the papyri from *Elephantine*. The OT narratives of the *covenants* between tribes and nations and between individuals give us the “place in life” of such documents. And in the life story of Jeremiah we once have the opportunity to see the rôle they played in private life, and how the situation at that time was handled when a contract had to be set up (Jer.32).

Although we possess a series of narratives concerning agreements between political parties (Gen. 21,22–32; 26,26–31; 31,44–54; Jos. 9,15; 1 Ki. 5,16–23) we have no *state documents* preserved in the OT like e.g. the *treaties* between Egyptian and Hittite kings which in one case has come down to us in two

<sup>1)</sup> Die josianische Reform, pp. 98ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. below, p. 224.

forms, in the languages of the two high contracting parties. We are told a little of the contents, but the document itself is not quoted. Only in 1 Macc. 8,22-32 we have a document, the treaty of alliance between Judah the Maccabee and the Romans. It is not certain that the text gives a real copy of the original document, but at least the form is genuine.

Nevertheless we are able to form an idea of how the documents of this kind looked in ancient times, not only through the recovery of documents from the world surrounding Israel, but also by means of OT narratives in which e.g. the relations between God and men are regulated. Here we hear of *rites* which probably to some extent had similar forms when *covenants* were concluded between human partners (Gen. 15,9-18; Ex. 24,3-8; 2 Ki. 23,1-3, cf. Gen. 31,44ff.). Eissfeldt<sup>1)</sup> also thinks that the formulas attached to laws, especially the concluding blessings and curses (e.g. Deut. 28), allow inferences concerning the formulas used on such occasions. Ruth 4,7 tells us of an ancient custom connected with acts of this kind<sup>2)</sup>. Passages like Gen. 9,9ff. and especially 17,4ff. with their scrupulous enumeration of the duties of both contracting parties certainly tell us something of the form of contracts. We must be thankful for the legal interests of the so-called Priestly source which have induced the author to give us these formulas. 2 Sam. 5,3, 1 Ki. 12, and Judg. 9,8-18 allude to the covenant between king and people at the election of the kings. In poetical form the *oath of the king* on this occasion is probably given in Ps. 101. Eissfeldt thinks<sup>3)</sup> that 1 Sam. 8,11-17 is in form an imitation of a *royal covenant* corrupted through the inimical attitude of the story teller towards the kingdom. 1 Macc. 14,29-47 may be a document of similar type. A great official document is preserved in Neh. 10. Some formulas of civil law, *contracts of sale*, are found in Gen. 23,16-17, cf. 30,28-34. Tob. 7,16 mentions a *marriage contract*, and Deut. 24,1ff., Is. 50,1, and Jer. 3,8 allude to *contracts of divorce*.

To the class called documents we also reckon the many *catalogues* of very different contents: genealogies<sup>4)</sup>, lists of officials, of heroes, of towns - drawn up for different ends, descriptions of frontiers, lists of gifts to the sanctuary etc.

Many of such inventories are later constructions, while others may be copies of original documents, belonging to the contexts in which they stand, as monuments of the times the history of which is related. The problems of "genuineness" are irrelevant to us in this connection where we are not concerned with historical criticism. Formally they generally are genuine enough.

<sup>1)</sup> p. 21f. <sup>2)</sup> cf. Deut. 25, 9, and Rudolph's commentary on Ruth, p. 5f.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 22. <sup>4)</sup> See V. Grönbech, *The Culture of the Teutons* (1931), I, pp. 363ff.; III, pp. 25ff. Johs. Pedersen, *Israel I-II*, pp. 257, 267. Cf. the *Appendix*.



The *forms* of contracts are generally very "functionalistic". The usual form, e.g. in the *Elephantine* texts, is that they begin with a date: "On the 7th of Chisleu, that is the 4th day of the month Thoth, the 9th year of Artaxerxes the king, said Ya'uhan daughter of Meshullak, spinster(?) of Yeb the fortress, to Meshullam b. Zaccur, Jew, of Yeb the fortress, as follows: You have given to me as a loan the sum of...". Then follow the conditions attached to this affair. Documents may contain the name of the scribe to whom the document was dictated. It ends with a list of witnesses and perhaps with a subscription giving a short summary of its contents.

State documents usually give some history of the relations between the parties, as seen in the treaty between king Hattušil III of Hatti with king Bentšina of Amurru quoted in the list of literature below. They may of course also contain curses towards those who break the treaty.

Also the OT examples are in a very matter of fact style, as befits the situation. Typical are the covenants between Yahweh and Abraham in Gen. 17 or between Yahweh and Noah in Gen. 9. They simply enumerate the duties of both parties; note the "I" at the beginning of the promises of Yahweh and the "You, as for you", when the enumeration of the duties of Abraham commences! The contracts are related to the imperative style of the categorical laws.

An example of the style is also the document of *Neh. 10*. Here we first get the names of the high official members of the community apparently combined with their *seals*. The body of the contract begins (v. 29) by mentioning the *oath* securing the covenant, and then follows the enumeration of duties.

These examples may suffice. It would be a useful work to give a full description of the various forms of oriental contracts. The examples given show some affinities to the letter-form (in the introductions), but also to the laws (in the enumeration of duties).

*Literature: State documents from Israel's neighbours:* AOT, pp. 379-80. Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*, part II (1933). Weber, *Die Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrer* (1907), pp. 24ff. Friedrich, *Aus dem hethitischen Schrifttum I* (AO, 24, 3), pp. 14-22, 31-32. Bauer, *Ein aramäischer Staatsvertrag aus dem 8. Jahrh. v. Chr.* (Archiv für Orientforschung 1932, pp. 1-16). Weidner, *Der Staatsvertrag Assurniraris VI von Assyrien mit Mat'ilu von Bit-Agusi* (ibid. pp. 17-34).

*Contracts from Palestine:* S. A. Cook, *The Religion of Palestine in the Light of Archaeology* (1930), p. 64f. and T. XII, cf. AOB nos. 595-6. The *Elephantine* documents in Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the 5th Century B. C.* (1923), give a great number of *contracts* of different kinds. Further material of this category in various publications of Babylonian and Assyrian texts. Both among the *Ras Shamra* texts, the *Lachish* letters, and the *Elephantine* papyri are also *lists* of names and of dues to temples et al. From other parts of the Semitic world we have similar inventories, e. g. *sacrificial tariffs*.

*Alt, Israels Gaue unter Salomo* (Kittel-Festschr. 1913). Judas Gaue unter Josia (PJB



1925, pp. 100–116). Eine galiläische Ortsliste in Jos. 19 (ZATW 1927, pp. 59–81). Noth, Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels (1930), pp. 122–132. On the lists in Chron., see especially Rothstein's commentary. Criticism of the theories of Alt in Mowinkel, Zur Frage nach den dokumentarischen Quellen in Josua 13–19 (1946). – Contenau, La Civilisation des Hittites ... (1948), pp. 102ff. – L. Matouš, in Symbolae ... Hrozny dedicatae II, pp. 153ff. and V, pp. 11ff.

### Letters.

The ancient Orient had a rich epistolary literature. Among the sources for the history of Palestine some of the most important are the contents of the Egyptian State archives from *El Amarna*, the tablets from *Taanach*, and the papyrus letters from *Elephantine*. More recent discoveries are the very much discussed ostraca from *Tell ed-Duweir*, the ancient *Lachish*, and the very important non-Jewish letters from the collection of *Borchardt* the edition of which has been announced by G. R. Driver.

While a very great part of the NT literature belongs to this category it is relatively scarce in the OT. The Hebrew term for "letter" is the same word as the one used for every kind of writing, *sefer*. In post-exilic times we find the words *miktāb* and *'iggereth*.

The first letter mentioned by OT history is the ill-famed letter of *David* which sent *Uriah* to death, and of which a sentence is quoted in 2 Sam. 11, 15. Whether this really is a quotation of the very letter of David to Joab, is of course uncertain, for the story teller may have followed the custom of writers of antiquity to insert words spoken or written by the heroes or villains of their stories invented by the author himself in order to vivify the narrative. In the same way 1 Ki. 21, 8–10 uses *Jezebel's* letter to the elders and nobles of *Jezreel*, and 2 Ki. 5, 5–6 a letter from the king of *Aram*. In 2 Ki. 10, 1–3 a quotation from a letter of *Jehu* to officials in *Samaria* is introduced by a curious *wē'attā*, "and now", certainly the regular formula introducing the main part of a letter, following after the introduction consisting of the name of the sender, the name of the addressee, and generally a benediction-formula of greeting to the receiver of the letter. In Ezra 4, 10–11 we have the word corresponding to the Hebrew of 2 Ki. 10, 1–3, in Aramaic *ukē'enet*<sup>1)</sup>. The introduction generally corresponds to the forms known from Babylonian style, e.g. in the *Amarna* letters. 2 Ki. 19, 9–14 tells of a message from *Senacherib* to *Hezekiah*. Here we hear both of a messenger and of a letter in a way illustrating how the form of the letter develops from the orally delivered message, cf. Gen. 32, 3–6; Num. 20, 14–19. *Jeremiah* has used the form of the letter to express some of his most epoch-making thoughts (29, 1–23). In the

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Ges.*; *Buhl's* Hebrew lexicon.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. II.

same chapter (24-32) parts of two other letters, to and from a priest *Shemaiah*, concerning Jeremiah, are preserved.

From *Persian* and *Hellenistic* periods we have some complete letters. They are good representatives of Persian and Hellenistic official style (Ezra chs. 4-6 and 7, a series of letters in 1-2 Macc. and those referred to in the Letter of *Aristeas*). Whether these documents are real state documents or works of *fiction* as often in ancient authors, does not concern us here. At any rate they are genuine specimens of the letter-style of antiquity: They are *formally* "real letters".

### *Epistles.*

On the other hand antiquity also knows a type of literature which in spite of its outward form is no real letter. As designation of such "artificial" letters the history of literature has made use of the word "*epistles*". Such "*epistles*" often reveal their nature by lacking either the initial or the concluding formulae. Examples in the OT are the *edict of Nebuchadnezzar*, Dan. 3,31-4,34, the apocryphal *Epistula Jeremiae*<sup>1)</sup> and the last part of the *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*<sup>2)</sup>. According to *Eissfeldt*<sup>3)</sup> the latter example is an imitation of a special type, the so-called "*festival letter*", regulating cultic relations.

*Literature:* The Amarna letters, ed. by Knudtzon. The Elephantine texts, by Cowley. The Lachish letters, ed. by H. Torczyner (1938), cf. Hempel, ZATW 1938, pp. 126ff.; Hammershaimb in Dansk Teologisk Tidsskr. 1940, pp. 91ff.; Winton Thomas, Journ. of Theol. Stud. 1939, pp. 1-15, cf. Palestine Expl. Quarterly 1946, pp. 38-39, on a new, Hebrew, edition of the texts, with new documents and new views of Torczyner.

Willrich, Urkundenfälschung in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur (1924). Beer, Zur israel. Briefliteratur (in the Kittel-Festschrift 1913). Buhl, Den private Brevskrivning i Oldtiden (1917). Deissmann, Licht vom Osten (1923), pp. 193ff. Roller, Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe (1933). Wendland, Die urchristlichen Literaturformen (1912). Carsten Hoeg, Cicero (1942), pp. 244ff. - cf. II, p. 223 and Abel, Les Livres des Maccabées (1949), pp. 299ff., on the Festival Letter of 2 Macc. 1.

### *Laws.*

We have seen that it was the task of the priests to mediate *tōrah* to the people. The term *tōrah* is not quite clear as regards the original meaning of the words. Recently, Gunnar Östborn has examined it afresh<sup>4)</sup> and has described it as

<sup>1)</sup> cf. II.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. II.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 25.

<sup>4)</sup> Gunnar Östborn, Tora in the Old Testament, a semantic study, cf. Engnell in Symbolae Bibl. Upsal. 1946, pp. 1ff., Hammershaimb, in Svensk Teologisk Kvartalsskrift 1947, pp. 377ff.



denoting the idea of "*showing the way*" or perhaps "*indication with the finger*". But he also finds an affinity between this term and Accadian *wa'āru*, "go", "send", and *arū*, "go", "lead", "conduct", ("instruct"). He is however most inclined to favour the first possibility ("to show the way"), that the conception characteristically associated with *tōrah* is "instruction", not "sending forth". Further he is strongly inclined to reject the theory combining the word with the action of "drawing the lots" and likewise the theory of the word being a loan-word in Hebrew, Accadian *tērtu*.

After this start he tries to prove that further meanings of the term "resolve themselves into three: "Directive", "instruction", and "law"."

By the first word, "directive", he characterizes pronouncements of no great length and of a more occasional character. Such "directives" may have been delivered in the form of "divine responses", "oracles"; in some instances they were based upon, or consisted of, concrete "signs", "*omina*".

By "*instruction*" he understands "a more elaborate statement intended to inculcate knowledge of some kind" by *priests* on cultic matters, but also with reference to Yahweh's "law" in general, by *prophets* primarily in the form of ethico-religious instruction, and by the *wise men* in the form of "Wisdom doctrine".

The connotation "*law*" is not less ancient than the two other meanings. "Even "*oracular tōrah*", based upon, or consisting of, "signs", *omina*, must be deemed, in certain cases, to have comprised "verdict", "judgment", "law"". The instruction in the law was largely carried out by the *priests*, and therefore the word came to be employed in priestly circles in the sense of "the law".

Östborn's book is undoubtedly of great value, even if certain minor reserves may be made. Even if the word does not denote "oracle", and even if it should have nothing to do with the Accadian *tērtu*<sup>1</sup>) it is still evident that it has some connections with cultic functions and with the priests as imparters of ritual "instruction" and of inculcation of "Yahweh's law." This is also clear from Östborn's chapter on the rôle of the king as imparter of *tōrah*. Östborn is here influenced by the ideas of the sacral kingship which certainly are of importance for our understanding of ancient manners and customs. There is a strong link between law and cult. Also other "juridical" words, like *mišvāh*, "command", and *dābār*, "word", may be understood on a religious background. The same is true of *mišpāt*, regarding the fact that an oracle-sanctuary as *Kadesh* can be called '*en mišpāt*, "the Well of the Law" (Gen. 14,7). To distinguish between "religious" *dēbārīm* and "profane" *mišpātīm*<sup>2</sup>) is therefore not easy. "Profane" laws in Israel are "religious" laws. A term like *hok* may be understood in combination with the inscribing of laws on tablets (Deut. 29,1ff.). But a

<sup>1</sup>) as assumed by Zimmern, cf. my commentary on Ps. 1,1.

<sup>2</sup>) Kuenen, Einleitung I, 1, p. 48, cf. p. 233. Mowinkel, Le Décalogue (1927), p. 32f.



passage like Ps. 2,7 proves the use of the word as denoting an oracular message. It may originally have been connected with the idea of the heavenly tables of fate<sup>1</sup>). It seems clear that the different terms cannot be utilized to classify different categories of literature and their place in life.

But so much I think we are justified to say, that there is a connection, only not an exclusive one, between the *law-literature* and the *priestly oracle*. The oracle of the *sacred lots* was in the hands of the priests. The Levitical programme Deut. 33,8ff. shows us this connection. Here the instruction in the law is mentioned before the sacrificial activities of the priests<sup>2</sup>) and derived from Levi's possession of the sacred lots. The oracle gave decisions and so created law, of course primarily in the cultic, but certainly also in the wider "religious", "ethical", and "legal" field. Oracles are preserved in memory, oral tradition becomes *customary law* and is by and by collected in greater complexes and preserved in writing.

But others besides the priests have also had a similar authority in the matter of law. In ancient times the priesthood was in many cases not separated from the activity of the *tribal chiefs* and the *heads of families*. The "*Elders*", the people with a beard (*zākēn*), have always been clothed with authority in Israel. But in the course of time this royal and patriarchal authority grows independent beside the priestly oracles, often in competition with them<sup>3</sup>). 1 Sam. 30,25 traces a regulation of law back to *David*. But Num. 31,27 (according to common opinion a younger passage) places the same directive in the mouth of *Moses*. Whether *Moses* as a lawgiver represents the chiefs or the priests (Levites in the Deuteronomic sense of the word), may be discussed. For the earlier periods it will be of no great importance. Both represent sacral institutions. But some regulations seem to presuppose a sort of "profane" authority, or perhaps "civil" is a better word. From this civil authority difficult cases may be referred to the sacral, priestly decisions of the oracle (Ex. 18,13ff.; Deut. 1,9ff.; 17,8ff.). This seems to indicate that a sort of "*secularisation*" has taken place. It may be supposed to be linked up with a "*secularisation*" of kingship in later pre-exilic periods. We know positively that at this time the priests denied the kings certain cultic rights<sup>4</sup>). Kings and their officials have comparatively early taken the judicial authority in their hands. We find *David* in regular activity as a judge (2 Sam. 15,2f.; cf. 14,1ff.). The legend of the *Solomonic judgment* is very illuminating too. Of course, in such early days this

<sup>1</sup>) cf. on this idea *Meissner*, *Babylonien und Assyrien* II, p. 124f.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *van Selms*, in *Symbolae ... Hrozny ded.* V, p. 323, n. 12.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. my *Die Josianische Reform*, pp. 78ff. and literature mentioned there.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. my *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie* (1931), p. 20f.

judicial function of the king may issue from his sacral, priestly dignity (Ps. 110,4). But in later periods a competition with the priests sprang up, and this may have been the cause of an incipient "secularisation" or "profanation" of the law. It never led to a complete emancipation of law from the religious sphere. Laws concerning "profane" or "civil" sides of life have always been invested with religious authority. Kings and other leaders are "*Servants of Yahweh*", and the decisions of the king had just the same religious foundation as that of the priest (cf. Prov. 16,10; 21,1)<sup>1</sup>).

Jer. 2,8 mentions besides priests, "shepherds" (i.e. kings) and prophets people called *toḥṣē ha-tōrāh*, "they that handle the law", apparently a special class of "*lawyers*". But 18,18 counts *tōrāh* to the dominion of the priests. This perhaps also (cf. above) witnesses to the incipient differentiation, ending in the development of the class of the *nomikoí*. In this development the activity of the sages of the Wisdom literature may have been of importance. As indicated above<sup>2</sup>) connections have existed between the sages and the cultic personnel. It is probable that the learned men of the temple schools in Israel got a special task in history when Jerusalem was sacked in 587: They were then the men capable of collecting the sacred traditions of the sanctuary, including the traditions of the law.<sup>3</sup>).

### *Foreign influence.*

To understand Israel's legal literature we do not nowadays require more or less scattered allusions like those given in the preceding paragraph. As in so many other cases we have to regard Israel's law-literature in connection with the cultures of Asia and Egypt. Especially the Mesopotamian and Hittite codes of law are of quite unique importance. We are not going to collect the many parallels between Israelite and old Sumerian, Assyrian, Babylonian, and Hittite laws. We restrict ourselves to a general reference to commentaries and the works mentioned in the selection of literature after the present chapter<sup>4</sup>).

Parallels of this kind, which are extremely numerous, show – in spite of

<sup>1</sup>) The representation has been remodelled in consequence of the criticism advanced by Engnell, *Gamla testamentet* I, p. 91, n. 1, against my words in the Danish edition p. 307. But I still hold that the desacralization of kingship has also led to tendencies of desacralization of legal activity, and that esp. Deut. 1,9 shows us the idea of an appeal from a "profane" or "civil" authority to sacral judgment.

<sup>2</sup>) pp. 173ff.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. also the fifth chapter in Östborn's book: *The Wise Man as Imparter of Tora*, pp. 112–126.

<sup>4</sup>) *Hylmö*, pp. 102ff., has some striking examples. – cf. *Albright*, in *The OT and Modern Study*, p. 38ff.



differences in regard to both style and legal conceptions – that *the OT laws are closely related to the legal culture of the Ancient Near East*. But this relationship can be explained in different ways.

*Essential mutual independence* has been maintained. Then the similarities are accounted for by the contention that similar ideas can have originated in separate spheres of culture. The ideas may “lie in the air” in various parts of the world. *Hylmö*<sup>1)</sup> has rightly repudiated this theory with reference to the likeness in the field of *style*, not only with regard to legal conceptions.

Another theory says that Semitic peoples have brought their legal material with them from their *common Semitic home*. But against this we must refer to the fact that *non-Semitic* nations such as *Sumerians* and *Hittites* share the peculiarities of the Semitic race in this sphere.

The third possibility is that the laws have *migrated* from land to land and from nation to nation, being individually developed according to the peculiarities of the different peoples both with regard to the conception of law and to style.

It was the *stele of Hammurapi* that first brought the problem to light in modern times. And scholars were for a long time inclined to regard this epoch-making work as the basic text, the Israelite laws being directly borrowed from the Code of Hammurapi. But the discovery of the *Assyrian* and the *Hittite* laws gave this theory its mortal wound. It was proved that there were parallels between Assyrian and Israelite laws which had no parallels in the Babylonian code. We know nothing of an Oriental “*Urcodex*”, and *Hylmö*<sup>2)</sup> rightly calls for cautiousness in this matter. It does not appear probable that Israelite laws should be regarded as directly dependent upon any of the Oriental codes known to us or upon a common Oriental “*Urcodex*”. We cannot here point to the influence of Yahwistic religion leading to deeper ethical insight. That cannot prove the impossibility of dependence upon a common source. But when some people think it possible to make good that Israelite law here and there exhibits a more “old-fashioned” appearance than the laws of the other cultures – *Hylmö* says, e.g., that it is tempting to speak of a “more primitive” character of the Laws in the OT –, then it only means that the cultural situation in Israelite laws is that of a more simple community, the legal formulations being not so precise and the proof often somewhat loose. All this shows that there cannot be any justification for the assumption of direct dependence. The opposite idea, that the developed complexes of law in Mesopotamia and Asia Minor should be dependent upon Moses is

<sup>1)</sup> p. 105.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 106.



impossible on grounds of age. These laws are older than the presumable date of Moses.

In our times there appears to be a stronger inclination to seek an explanation based upon the theory of *indirect influence* from Oriental law. This influence can have come to Israel along many roads and at many times.

Reference is made to the great *Aramaic migration*; further to *communications with other tribes during the "wanderings in the desert"*, and to the *symbiosis with the Canaanites* following the immigration into Palestine and the *cultural syncretism* resulting from these events.

Somewhere in the course of this process which cannot be followed in detail we must *presuppose the work of Moses* which in spite of the legendary character of the stories about him must be regarded as epoch-making, as much as, nay, even more so than the yet more legendary story of Zarathustra. The unanimity of tradition is here of compelling force.<sup>1)</sup> *Hylmö* thinks that *the conservative trend* in Israelite law to a certain extent can be explained from the work of Moses, later ages feeling a strong dread of altering too much of what was thought to have emanated from this great Servant of the Lord. But on the other hand *Hylmö* strongly emphasizes that *Canaanite syncretism* certainly in a rather high degree has asserted itself through Israel's taking over of Palestinian *sanctuaries* with their sacral laws and through the clash with the civil law of the Canaanite city-states<sup>2)</sup>. In this direction points the distinct *colouring from Canaanite religion* in many laws, cf. only the examples given by *Hylmö*: Ex. 21,28; Lev. 16,5; Deut. 21,23; 22,9ff. The *genuine Mosaic trend* is most probably identical with the Yahweh-religion itself, as expressed in the *First Commandment*, causing the ethical elevation of the legal ideas which in the course of centuries raised the laws of Israel above the common Oriental level<sup>3)</sup>.

When we regard the Israelite laws this *religious point of view* must always be kept in mind. The distinction of Latin law between *jus* and *fas* cannot be carried through clearly in Israel nor in the Oriental sphere as a whole<sup>4)</sup>. As was said above, distinction between "sacral" and "profane" is also difficult. The last redaction at least has made all Israelite law "theocratic law", "church law" if you like that expression. But the last redaction is only a late

<sup>1)</sup> cf. my *Israels Historie* (1930), p. 107. Cf. also H. H. Rowley, *Israel's Sojourn in Egypt* (1938); *Moses and the Decalogue* (Bull. of the J. Rylands Libr. 1951), also in *French, Rev. de l'hist. et de la philos. rel.* 1952.

<sup>2)</sup> This is also underlined by *Johs. Pedersen*, *Israel I-II*, p. 18.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Hylmö*, p. 107; *De Wette*, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments* (1931), § 66.

<sup>4)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 27.

expression of a tendency dominating all Israel's history, e.g. already the laws or the so-called *Book of the Covenant* (roughly Ex. 20,22-23,19 – the rest of ch. 23 is “Deuteronomistic”). This is common Oriental form. The Code of Hammurapi too appears as given to the divine king by the Sun god, the God of Justice, i.e. with religious sanction. The distinction of Israel lies in the qualitative difference between its religion and those of the surrounding world. When we talk of *sacred* and *profane* law we mean that there are laws concerning civil, daily life and others regulating the cult and the ethics determined by it, distinct from the purely legal-social.

### *Smallest units.*

The notable parallels between Israelite laws and those of the neighbouring nations appear to belong to sections of rather great age. We point to Ex. 21,2-22,16, Deut. 21,15-17 and 22,13-29. The practical legal directives contained in these passages consist of a series of *units* not capable of being divided into smaller pieces and therefore probably formally independent corpora: Ex. 21,2-11 (slaves); 12-17(÷ 13-14) (crimes punished by death); 18,27 (injuries towards freemen and slaves); 28-32 (the goring ox); 33-36 (cattle); 21,37-22,3 (cattle stealing); 22,4-5 (injury to fields); 6-8 (on trust); 9-14 (responsibility of shepherds and of people borrowing other men's cattle); 15-16 (seduction of a virgin). The sections found in Deut. are of similar kind and certainly comparatively old in spite of the patent adaptation by the Deuteronomist in some places.

Eissfeldt<sup>1)</sup> dates the sections from Ex. in the time between the immigration and the drawing up of the Book of the Covenant to which they now belong. At least it is certain that they reflect the conditions of an agricultural community. The ox is not an animal characteristic of nomads. It may be found among half-nomads, the culture depicted in the stories of the Patriarchs, people who are about to settle down in the agricultural society<sup>2)</sup>. Therefore it is intelligible that we meet the parallels to the legal culture of the city-states just in these sections.

Side by side with these legal elements of civil character we find others, concerning the *cult*. As characteristic examples Eissfeldt<sup>3)</sup> first reviews a type which he calls “*agendas*”, directions concerning some kinds of sacrifices, clean and unclean animals, leprosy etc. Subjects of this kind are treated in various

<sup>1)</sup> p. 27f. <sup>2)</sup> cf. Alt, PJB 1939. – Albright, in *The OT and Modern Study*, p. 39, says that the cultural background of the Book of the Covenants is the Bronze-, i.e. the Mosaic Age. But this is no *proof of Mosaic origin* (cf. Appendix to II, p. 56, n. 1).

<sup>3)</sup> p. 28.



parts of Lev. and Num. in smaller sections with a formulation of their own, characteristically different from the sections in Ex. and Deut. just mentioned. In most cases of the passages from Lev. and Num. we have to peel off the formulas of introduction emanating from the hand of the editor of the so-called Priestly source ("P"), e.g. Lev. 1,1-2. But this done we have elements of law capable of standing alone, and not even – as *Eissfeldt* thinks – in need of being transformed into pieces speaking in the 3rd person, losing their character of words spoken by God himself. We even find *superscriptions* giving the contents of the passages, cf. Lev. 6,2; 7,18; Num. 19,10b, 14a, cf. Lev. 7,1,11; 14,2; Num. 6,13. In other passages we encounter *subscriptions*: Lev. 7,37(38); 11,46-47; 12,7; 13,59; 14,3,54-47; 15,32-33; Num. 5,29; 6,21; 30,17. These super- and subscriptions are, certainly, late and in many cases added by redactors, says *Eissfeldt*. But they give us nevertheless the marks of collectors enabling us to discern the original "element of law", the smallest independent unit. And the tenacity of style goes to show that these marks may be old formulas or at least built on the pattern of such time-honoured phrases. *Eissfeldt* rightly singles out a subscription like that of Lev. 14,54-57 as a means of making it clear to us how a law of leprosy was used: "to teach when it is unclean and when it is clean". From Deut. 24,8 we know that the impartor of such instruction concerning leprosy was the *priest*, and so we find that "agendas" of this kind were at home in priestly circles.

A great deal of such "elements" we must accordingly understand as *professional directives for the priests*<sup>1)</sup>. In their present form they are comparatively young and represent the practice at the temple of Jerusalem in the latest times before the exile. But we may with great assurance say that similar forms have been in existence already in very early days. The sections preserved also contain much ancient material, already characterized by Wellhausen as the "*ethnic*" material in P<sup>2)</sup>. Accordingly it is probable that this material dates back to very early days, perhaps to the days when *oral tradition* was absolutely supreme, and the *form*, not only the material, is old. Further we have to realize the fact, already noticed by Wellhausen<sup>3)</sup>, that Israel in this field too is dependent upon the Canaanite forms and customs. Here we are not only building upon assumptions. For *Phoenician tariffs of sacrifice* from *Marseilles* and *Carthage*<sup>4)</sup> furnish us with good analogies which even, if late, in their present form nevertheless take us back to the 2nd millennium B. C. And from this period the *Ras Shamra*

<sup>1)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 29.

<sup>2)</sup> Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (6th ed.), pp. 346, 364, cf. 421.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 29.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, nos. 42 and 43.



cuneiform tablets have now presented us with a series of similar works<sup>1)</sup>. "Agendas" of this sort were the rules of the priests, originally remembered and handed down orally, destined to be the foundation of the instruction of visitors to the temple.

Concerning the *form* of rules belonging to this category *Eissfeldt*<sup>2)</sup> assumes that it generally has been a sort of *report*. If the rule concerns the priests themselves, however, we find the form of address directing the words to the priests (Num. 18). This too has Phoenician analogies. But *Eissfeldt* further presumes that the form of address also has been used in texts in which the priests had to address the people in God's name. *Eissfeldt* is however a little sceptical with regard to the assumption that all cultic material was originally directed to lay-folk, and accordingly existed in independent form like the priestly "agendas". More probably there also existed a lot of "agendas" of "reporting" form transformed into a sermon-like style, especially in Deut.<sup>3)</sup>

In contrast to the sections containing civil and cultic law, corpora of the type represented by the so-called *Decalogue* ("decalogues" and "dodecalogues", Ex. 20, Deut. 5, Ex. 34, Deut. 27, 15ff.) are not units of the smallest kind. They are *compositions* of "words" formally independent of one another, but forming coherent units. The individual commandments of which these small compositions consist are evidently of a legal kind<sup>4)</sup>, and formally the compositions are related to the "elements of law" mentioned above. *Eissfeldt* also compares them to the so-called "laymen's catechisms"<sup>5)</sup>, compositions of different kinds, e.g. the *calendars* of feasts (Ex. 23, 14-17; 34, 18, 22-24; Lev. 23, 9, 21, 39-43), *catalogues* of "forbidden degrees" of kinship in marriage laws (Lev. 18, 6-18), and of animals which may and may not be eaten (Lev. 11, 1-23; 11, 41, 47; Deut. 14, 4-20). Here the sacrificial tariffs from Marseilles and Carthage present analogies leading us to assume that Israel also knew official announcements of these kinds, eventually lying behind Lev. 7, 28-36 or Deut. 18, 1-4.<sup>6)</sup>

These sections of the type represented by the Decalogue are nevertheless so far *units*, ten or twelve combined commandments constituting a peculiar *type*. From the point of view of history of literature this type has been combined with the *tōrah-liturgies*<sup>7)</sup> dealing with conditions of access to the sanctuary.

<sup>1)</sup> see *Bauer*, Die alphabetischen Keilschrifttexte von Ras Shamra (Kl. Texte ..., herausg. v. Lietzmann (1936)), nos. 1, 3, 9, 19, 48 und 23.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 30.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. especially Deut. 15, 14 - 14 and 18 compared with Ex. 22, 2-6 (*Eissfeldt*, loc. cit.).

<sup>4)</sup> cf. below, p. 222.

<sup>5)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 31.

<sup>6)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 31f.

<sup>7)</sup> cf. p. 161f.

Formally the compilation of ten or twelve commandments reminds us of certain phenomena in the *Wisdom* literature<sup>1)</sup>, and – to go farther afield – of the “Haustafeln” in *Luther’s* Minor Catechism. The use of the Decalogue for confession in Roman and at Holy Communion in Anglican practice is in fact not very far from the place in life which it had originally.

By means of such explanations we approach a theory to be advanced later following *Hylmö*: Between the indivisible smallest units and the greater law books (e.g. The Book of the Covenant) there are *medium units*, corresponding to old Scandinavian “balks”<sup>2)</sup>. *Hylmö* compares in a very interesting way decalogues and dodecalogues to the “*tabulae*” of Roman law<sup>3)</sup>, a “*tabula*” being an independent collection of laws, even if it is of no great size.

Concerning the decalogues etc. it must be noticed that they are now a comparatively *young type*. It is only the *short* commandments and prohibitions which belong to the types of legal literature, i.e. the categorical and apodeictic imperatives<sup>4)</sup>. The *motivations* and other extensions now attached to the single commandments in Ex. 20 and Deut. 5 are generally of another kind coloured by Deuteronomistic and priestly admonition-style<sup>5)</sup>, perhaps also – in the commandment to honour the parents – by the eudaimonistic attitude of the *Wisdom* literature: In the present form we see a *mixture of styles* undoubtedly arraying itself with the historical causes<sup>6)</sup> for the assumption that in the present form the Decalogue of Ex. 20 and Deut. 5 is young. Similar observations must be made concerning Ex. 34, 11–16; 24.

A legal type which also must be mentioned is the shorter or longer *narrative* deriving some custom from a situation in the life of the ancestors. *Eissfeldt* compares this variety of aetiological legends<sup>7)</sup> to the Islamic *hadith*<sup>8)</sup>. Festivals and cultic customs in this way are derived from “historical” events (Ex. 12, 27; 13, 14–15; Num. 9, 6–13; 15, 23, 36; 27, 1–11; 31; 36, 1–12). Such narratives are really laws. Gen. 22 in some respects also belongs to this type (giving permission to substitute human sacrifice by an animal). The type is in certain cases represented by rather late examples. But *Eissfeldt*<sup>9)</sup> is probably right in his assumption that fiction has here been modelled after the realities of life.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 175f.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 227.

<sup>3)</sup> *Hylmö*, pp. 113 and 176.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. pp. 224ff.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. pp. 208 ff.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. II.

<sup>7)</sup> cf. pp. 235 ff.

<sup>8)</sup> cf. *Schaeder* in RGG, 2nd ed. III, cols. 401–11.

<sup>9)</sup> p. 32.

We have now, mainly in adhesion to usual classification<sup>1)</sup> regarded different types of legal literature nearly all representing concentrated units not capable of being divided into smaller elements. An exception was the form of the decalogues etc. and "laymen's catechisms" (Ex. 13,44; Deut. 6,20ff.<sup>1a)</sup>).

The form in those smallest units is nearly always *prose*. But often we have to take into account that *poetical* form has preceded the *prosaic*. The legal sentence communicated orally by the priests has now and then the rhythmical form of the oracular sentence<sup>2)</sup>. But we cannot conclude that a rhythmical sentence in a legal context always is evidence of *old* poetry in legal literature. *Hylmö*<sup>3)</sup> is right when he quotes Gen. 9,6 with its rhythm, artificial repetition of words, and powerful assonances, and calls this a legal sentence. This can be seen from its form<sup>4)</sup>. But when he mentions Lev. 19,32 he is of course right in saying that this reminds us of the rhythm and parallelism of the Wisdom sentence ("proverb"); but he is not right in calling the passage a legal sentence, for it is simply an element from the teaching of the sages which has slipped into the Code of Holiness, one of the rules of Wisdom for good behaviour<sup>5)</sup>. Also with regard to the contents the passage is no legal sentence, but a moral admonition. Similar observations hold good concerning the other examples mentioned by *Hylmö*: Ex. 20,2; Deut. 5,5; or Ex. 34,14b (self-predications or hymn-like elements). They are simply foreign types inserted in legal literature representing the mixture of types characteristic of the degeneration of the forms in later parts of the history of literature<sup>6)</sup>. We may also refer to our words above<sup>7)</sup> concerning the Decalogue: admonition and the influence of the Wisdom literature are here quite distinct features.

Real poetical developments of legal material we find in *tōrāh*-liturgies such as Ps. 15 and the corresponding verses of Ps. 24<sup>8)</sup>. These poetical pieces give us perhaps the "Urforms" of decalogues and dodecalogues together with hints concerning their original place in the cult, cf. the ritual in Deut. 27. But in the medium and greater collections now found in the Pentateuch we must be prepared to encounter so much mixture of types that we can only with caution venture to take everything as primary legal material on the ground of poetical form.

1) cf. *Eissfeldt*. – 1a) cf. *van Selms*, *Symbolae ... Hrozny* ded. V, p. 323, n. 12.

2) *Hylmö*, p. 107f.

3) p. 108.

4) cf. p. 224.

5) cf. Sir. 8, 7, *Humbert*, *Recherches sur les sources égyptiennes de la littérature sapientiale d'Israël*, p. 167.

6) cf. p. 208f.

7) cf. p. 221.

8) cf. Ps. 118, 19–20; 132, 8–9.



*The style of the legal rules.*

The small independent units can have different forms. It is customary to classify the various styles in the commandments under three main groups<sup>1)</sup>: a) Commandments of different *hypothetical* forms; b) commandments of *categorical* or – what is the same thing – *apodeictic* form; c) *mixed forms*.

Alt<sup>2)</sup> thinks that the *hypothetical* form points back to common *Oriental* material, especially the Mesopotamian laws and the laws of the Hittite empire in Asia Minor, which through the medium of the Canaanites invaded Israel. On the other hand the *apodeictic* form appears to represent genuine Israelite material, especially in the priestly *tōrah* which has, however, not avoided Canaanite influence<sup>3)</sup>.

The *hypothetical* form expresses the *casuistic* character of Oriental law. It does not give general rules of law to be applied to many, if possible to all cases. But it selects *one typical* case: When this or that occurs this or that must be done. Deviations, or cases supplementing the situation in some direction or other, or special cases of the variety treated, may be added in the form of a new hypothesis.

The hypothesis can be expressed in different ways. One may use the common grammatical form, a sentence introduced by *'im* or *kī*, "if" or "when". As a rule the arrangement is the following: The main case is introduced by *kī*, subordinated special cases by *'im*, cf. e.g. Ex. 21,7–11; 21,14 (without subordinated cases); 21,20–21 (special case with *'ak 'im*; 21,22–23 etc.).

In the same chapter, v. 12 and 15–17, we have another form of hypothetical law style. The case is introduced by means of particles, and the punishment to be inflicted is expressed by a verb reinforced by the preceding *infinitivus absolutus* of the same verb, *mōt jūmat*. This type is also represented by the rhythmic<sup>4)</sup> rule on blood revenge Gen. 9,6, which therefore through its form must be recognized as a legal sentence. Perhaps it also through the participial style governing it points back to an old verse form of laws. The solemn form with the inf. abs. also reminds us of a more elevated style than the usual form.

In Lev. 20 we encounter a third form of hypothetical legal style in a series of regulations introduced by *'iš* or *nefēš*, followed by a relative clause introduced by *'āšer*. Here too in the subsequent clause the punishment is mentioned in the solemn inf. abs.-form. *ʔāšer* can also be used as introduction (Deut. 19,4ff.).

The *categorical* form consists of *commandments and prohibitions* in 2nd pers.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. Hylmö, pp. 109ff.

<sup>2)</sup> in the book mentioned p. 232. – Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1946), pp. 204f.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. also Noth, *Die Gesetze im Pentateuch* (1940), p. 53.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. in Cod. Hammurapi, *van Selms*, *Symb. ... Hrozny* ded. V. p. 323, n. 12.

*sing. imperf.* or a *categorical imperative* with *lo'*: "Thou shalt" (2nd pers. imperf.) and "thou shalt not" (imp.). This form dominates the Decalogue in its primitive form, but also many other commandments and prohibitions, e.g. Ex. 22, 27-23,3; 23,6-9. We also find a *plural form*, e.g. Ex. 20,23. *Hylmö* also mentions as example Lev. 19,30<sup>1)</sup>. An absolute commandment or prohibition can also be expressed through a construction with 3rd pers. e.g. Deut. 19,15; 22,5a.

*Mixed forms* we have when a hypothetical form is combined with 2nd pers. sing. as in Ex. 21,2-6. Here we have the hypothetical form in its common structure with main case introduced by *kī* and subordinate cases with *'im*, but – different from vv. 7ff. – 2nd pers. imperf. in v. 2. which however is abandoned in the rest of the section, cf. also 23,4-5, placed in the midst of a series of categorical commandments<sup>2)</sup>. – A combination with 2nd pers. plur. imperf. also occurs, e.g. Lev. 19,23ff.; Num. 35,10ff. Here we have therefore a peculiar amalgamation of hypothetical and categorical forms which of course issues in hypothetical form and meaning.

Two hypothetical formulations may also be combined. The typical case is the construction beginning with *'iš* combined with the one introduced by *kī*. This gives a sort of *casus pendens-construction*. It is certainly not due to clumsiness, but a strong expression of fixed style. This is proved – as *Hylmö* underlines<sup>3)</sup> – by the fact that the word *'iš* is repeated, of course in order to make clear the importance of the case, see e.g. Lev. 24,15,17, and also Lev. 20,27, where the Samaritanus, however, reads *'ašer* for *kī*, certainly an attempt to smoothe the text., cf. the form used in the rest of the chapter.

*Hylmö* rightly warns<sup>4)</sup> against the use of the rule of the "Gattungsforschung": that mixed forms are young, in such a manner that this is made the foundation of an *absolute date*. From the fact that some of the examples quoted above have been taken from the Code of Holiness we are not justified in concluding that the mixed style belongs to the age ca. 600. For we also have it in the law on slaves in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 21,2ff.). Here it is quickly abandoned. But it is significant that it is found at that early date, so that consequently the reception of this law in the Book of the Covenant must be terminus ad quem. Comparative history of law believes that the oldest formulations generally are the forms with "if" and the categorical "thou shalt" and "you shall"-types, and of these again the categorical forms. This is accounted for by reference to the short form of expression which without ambages goes right in medias res.

<sup>1)</sup> *Hylmö*, p. 110. – They are probably early (cf. Mowinkel, Offersang, ch. XIV).

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 226.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 111.

<sup>4)</sup> loc. cit.

But it is more interesting, however, that the *hypothetical*, casuistic formulations, accordingly representing a comparatively late stage of history, seem to be a characteristic feature in *civil law*, *sacral law* regularly appearing in the *categorical* forms and that this form possibly represents more genuine Israelite material than the civil regulations.

*The confusion of styles in the collections of laws.*

The laws of the OT, as they lie before us now, present us with a stylistic difficulty. Not only are there regulations expressed in the mixture of styles just described. But we find laws of different form pushed into one another in a most disturbing manner. If we compare the OT laws with other legal collections from the Ancient Near East, this *confusion of styles* becomes clear to us. Everywhere in the world collections of laws are generally uniform in this respect. This must mean that the OT law books are what we may call "*secondary collections*". Much can be accounted for by the commonly accepted "*documentary hypothesis*" or other hypotheses explaining the composite character of the Pentateuch, which will be surveyed in the "Special Introduction".

But on the other hand this confusion is no absolutely late phenomenon. It already occurs in the *Book of the Covenant*, i.e. in the "period of the Judges" or the early time of the monarchy. Here, in 22,23–26, e.g., in four verses, we have three different formulations, one hypothetical (v. 25) and two different categorical. We find casuistic rules of different types, from 22,21ff. interrupted by categorical paragraphs, but again 23,4–5 we come upon an erratic block of hypothetical form. These stylistic criteria may to some extent be used for the *separation* of "sources", but not for reconstruction, because we know nothing of the sequence and therefore cannot know if there are lacunae.<sup>1)</sup>

*Original collections of uniform character.*

The confusion of styles must make it clear that before the compilation of the *Book of the Covenant*, the *Code of Holiness*, the original *Deuteronomy*, and the so-called *Priestly Code*, to name the larger legal corpora of the Pentateuch<sup>2)</sup>, there must have existed collections of uniformly formulated laws. *Hylmö*<sup>3)</sup> calls these "missing links" between the smallest independent units of law and the developed law books by a term, borrowed from old Scandinavian

<sup>1)</sup> cf. below, p. 261.

<sup>2)</sup> We might also mention Ez. 40ff.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 114.



law literature, “*balk*”. As proof of the existence of such “balks” he points to the *duplicates* of laws found at several places. In Lev. 22,23 and 23,9 e.g. we find sentences not only dealing with the same matter, but also showing the same motivations. It is also remarkable that *P* in Ex. 25–31 in categorical style describes the sanctuary and its implements, and then in 35–40 gives the same material in historical form. *Hylmö* in this case prefers to talk of two “balks” not of two “sources”. This seems to me to be somewhat hair-splitting. For two “balks” combined by a third author are as many “sources” + a more or less independent “redactor”. Similar observations may be made in the last instance mentioned by *Hylmö* as foundation for his – justified – assumption, the two sections of the Code of Holiness, Lev. 18,6–30 and 20,10–16, of which one exhibits *categorical*, the other *hypothetical* style, and also some differences of arrangement.<sup>1)</sup>

Examples of “balks” we find also in sections mentioned above in connection with decalogues etc. These sections are – in their *present* form – more or less marked by mixture of styles. But there is a strong probability that they have been of more uniform shape in their primitive forms<sup>2)</sup>. We may therefore think of some sort of development from smaller units to greater corpora, “balks”, which are then taken over by the “law books”, which in their turn are placed in the great, but shapeless complex, the Pentateuch.

But also the separate “law books” (Book of the Covenant, Code of Holiness etc.) are, in spite of their confusion of styles and their “duplicates”, *literary units*. This is seen from the fact that they possess introductions and conclusions setting them in a historical frame and making them appear as Words of God. This is clearly brought out in Deut., but also in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20, 22–23, 20–23, 27–31) and in the Code of Holiness (Lev. 17,1–2; 26,1–46). *Hylmö*<sup>3)</sup> also refers to the Priestly source, where the law book of this document by means of Ex. 24,15–18 is placed in the situation at Sinai, while the conclusion is formed by the description of the congregation starting on its march from the Holy Mountain (Num. 10,11–28). He also underlines that the author of the Book of the Covenant has inserted the civil laws in the sacral laws and so accentuated the divine character of civil law. Further, they have their individual *ethico-religious* programmes. The *Book of the Covenant* aims at placing civil law under the power of Yahweh. *Deuteronomy*, the *Code of Holiness* and *Peach* have their *cultic-theological* ideology<sup>4)</sup>. Also similar units such as the deca-

<sup>1)</sup> This is a proof that the *documentary hypothesis* cannot be called so antiquated as some Hotspurs nowadays like to pretend!

<sup>2)</sup> cf. pp. 221ff.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 115.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. II.

logues etc., in their present form, coloured by admonition and Wisdom style, appear as concentrated units.

### *State laws or sacral laws?*

The question of the "presuppositions and significance" of Israelite law has been singled out for a very intense treatment by *Martin Noth* in the book *Die Gesetze im Pentateuch, ihre Voraussetzungen und ihr Sinn*<sup>1)</sup>. On the background of the theological debate on the significance of the "Law" *Noth* examines the place in life of the different legal complexes and the canonical Law.

He begins by pointing out that *no Israelite law from pre-exilic times seems to be a result of legislative activities of the kings*, analogous to the work of *Hammurapi* or the *Hittite* laws. We hear of *judicial* activity of kings (2 Sam. 14,2ff.; 15,2ff.), and of their *execution* of punishment like the confiscation of property of executed criminals (1 Ki. 21,15); of their claims for *taxes* (2 Ki. 15,20), their *military* activity as supreme commanders of the forces of the nation (1 Sam. 14,50; 2 Sam. 8,16; 20,23; 1 Ki. 4,4, cf. 1 Sam. 8,12a<sup>2)</sup>). But we learn nothing at all of their activity as lawgivers, except that some single regulations are derived from them (1 Ki. 2,42f., cf. 1 Sam. 30,25, and above p. 214). Correspondingly the older laws exhibit no interest in the king and pay no attention to an order of the state. The word "king" does not occur till the special "*law of the king*" in Deut. 17,14-20 which quite evidently expresses the antipathy of this law to the kingship and advocates another constitution on the basis of which the law criticizes the actual kingship in Israel.

That this "law of the king" presupposes the non-existence of kingship, i. e. the fall of the Davidic dynasty in 587, proving the post-exilic origin of Deuteronomy<sup>3)</sup>, cannot be regarded as justified. *Noth*<sup>4)</sup> rightly says that the critical attitude of the law towards kingship is best understood if there is an actual reality against which criticism could be directed<sup>5)</sup>. In my book on *Die Josianische Reform* I have<sup>6)</sup> tried to prove that the ideal of Deuteronomy is an order of state where the rulers are "Judges", and that it considers kingship a concession to the unfaithfulness of Israel, as in the "theocratic source" of 1 Sam.<sup>7)</sup>

1) in Schriften der Königsberger gelehrten Gesellschaft, geisteswissenschaftliche Kl. 1940.

2) *Noth*, op. cit. p. 13. *Alt*, Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina (1930), pp. 32ff., 45ff.

3) e.g. *Johs. Pedersen*, Israel III-IV, p. 442f., p. 586.

4) op. cit. p. 14.

5) cf. *Gressmann*, ZATW 1924, p. 333f.

6) p. 52f.

7) cf. II.

It has not been possible to prove that any of the Israelite laws is a real "law of state". Especially concerning *Deut.* attempts have been made to establish a proof of its origin as state law, but without success. *Caspari*<sup>1)</sup> tried to explain the *Book of the Covenant* as a state law. Whether it originated in the time before *Saul*<sup>2)</sup> – a possible, although not certain assumption – the opinion of *Caspari* is very uncertain. The truth in *Caspari*'s reference to the connection between its casuistic elements and the common Oriental legal material is not that the *Book of the Covenant* as a whole is a state law. But Canaanite material from state laws has through its transition into Israelite law lost connection with state laws. It has been combined with material of another kind (the "genuine Israelite material"<sup>3)</sup>) and been transferred to another context.

In his further investigation Noth follows the usual track of the "Gattungsforschung" of *Gunkel*, to allow the literature to describe its place in life. The laws all refer to a definite human *society*, living in Palestine, worshipping Yahweh the God of Israel, with whom this society is connected through definite historical events. This holds true of all pre-exilic laws, including the *Code of Holiness*, by *Noth* rightly dated to the same times as the original Deuteronomy<sup>4)</sup>. The laws, further, are firmly bound up with the *tradition* of the immigration into Canaan, probably the sacred legend of the *Feast of Weeks*<sup>5)</sup> through which Israel admitted that it owed its possession of the Holy Land to an historical guidance by Yahweh (*Deut.* 26,5–10). The OT laws always speak to a society, the structure of which is decisively determined by the immigration-tradition and the traditions of the liberation from the bondage in Egypt; to a society bearing the name "*Israel*" and being sharply distinct from the aborigines of Canaan. All this<sup>6)</sup> proves the impossibility of combining the OT laws with any of the organisations of state in Israel. For the society described in the laws has never been identical with any of the Israelite or Judaic states. It has regularly been both greater and smaller than the actual states. The empire of David and Solomon comprised more than "*Israel*". And although the later states resulting from the "division of the kingdom" never comprised all "*Israel*", they on the other hand also contained elements which were not "*Israel*", territories of ancient city states with a population which the administration of the

<sup>1)</sup> ZDMG 1929, pp. 97–120, esp. pp. 104f.

<sup>2)</sup> *Noth*, op. cit., p. 15, cf. *Jepsen*, Untersuchungen zum Bundesbuch (1927), pp. 97ff.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. p. 224.

<sup>4)</sup> p. 5, n. 3, cf. my *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie* pp. 37ff.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. *von Rad*, Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs, pp. 37ff.

<sup>6)</sup> pp. 63–69.



states kept apart from the Israelite tribal territories (2 Sam. 24,5-7; cf. 1 Ki. 4,7-19; 2 Chron. 11,5-10)<sup>1)</sup>.

Noth however thinks it possible to prove that the "Israel" of the laws is a *sacral federation*, an "*amphictyony*" of tribes<sup>2)</sup> older than the formation of states in Israel, the time of the Judges. This amphictyony had as its centre the *Ark of the Covenant* and stands out over against the Canaanites through the confession to the immigration tradition and the salvation from the Egyptians at the Red Sea<sup>3)</sup>. This sacral federation has never been supplanted by the younger formations of states. But through the policy of *David* the Davidic-Solomonic palace-sanctuary became an *amphictyonic sanctuary*, a rank clothing it with authority outside the frontiers of the Judaic kingdom.

To this sacral institution, the Israelite Amphictyony, belong the Israelite laws, and to it they speak. And it is this sacral institution which *Josiah* through his reformation in 622 tried to identify with a state.

According to tradition the amphictyony has been founded by *Yahweh* himself through the covenant at *Sinai*. The ideas "covenant" and "law" are in the OT narrowly connected. The laws are traditionally all combined with *Moses* the legislator and the covenant at *Sinai*. They have all been antedated and compressed into a short space of time, but simultaneously their historical qualification has been underlined.

Important and theologically instructive in this connection is the circumstance that the *covenant appears to precede and be superior to the laws*, even if this relation in the younger strata is not so clear and is even being displaced.

The covenant between Israel and *Yahweh* is renewed by *Josiah* in 622. But at the same time he attempts to make Deut. a law of state. This is against its own intentions. But the king tries to make it the foundation of his political measures and cultic reforms. The part played by the law under *Josiah* became also the criterion of criticism in the Book of Kings.

In great detail *Noth* tries to show how the special Israelite material, the cultic-theological, with its attempts to guard Israel against apostasy, points to the *place in life of the laws*, their connection with a cultic, not a political system, a sacral alliance, a congregation, not a state.

These laws, then, according to *Noth*, lose the basis of their existence at the destruction of the amphictyonic sanctuary in 587. They would then have been without any place in life, had not a new one been found for them. But this is exactly what happened. The Law is saved through the hope of a "*new*

<sup>1)</sup> cf. my *Israels Historie*, p. 146.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Noth*, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (1930).

<sup>3)</sup> *Noth*, pp. 70ff.

covenant" (Jer. 31,31ff., Ez. 37,36ff.) in which also the Law has a place: God will create the possibility of its being kept by changing the hearts of the people. But also a restitution of the state is expected. The deported Jews prepare themselves for this by keeping the Law as far as it is possible under the "unclean" conditions in the dispersion. They live in expectation of a restitution taking forms as concrete as those of the laws in Ez. 40-48 and the Priestly Code.

Practical necessity leads to more than this. *Cyrus* creates the necessity by permitting the return to Palestine and the restoration of the temple, and so the ancient laws get a new significance. In the following years too the policy of the *Persian government* is of decisive influence. *Ezra's* activity is backed by the government, but the laws are not made real *Persian state laws*. Whereas they were formerly subordinate to the covenant they now become *conditions* for belonging to the covenant. The individual Jew must keep the Law to fulfil this condition. The accent is transferred from the act of God to the act, the resolve, of the individual man. This tendency has also been intensified by the dispersion of the Jews who – outside Palestine – were not so strongly attached to the sanctuary as those living in the Holy Land. More and more the Law is detached from the connection with a definite community. It becomes an absolute quantity, a power standing on legs of its own. In spite of its continued relation to the Jewish congregation all over the world the old relations have been turned upside down. Not the community, the covenant, is the presupposition of the Law, but the Law is the presupposition for the community. –

*Noth's* book is an important attempt to determine the special origin and place in life of the laws of Israel, in spite of their numerous connections with other Oriental laws. Everywhere we meet the religious background pointing to the fact that law and religion are related to one another, both rendering homage to something higher.

But there are also mistakes in *Noth's* conceptions. The most conspicuous is his inveterate idea of the kingdom as "weltlich", we venture to translate "profane". This makes him take a wrong view of the problem "state law or sacral law". *Josiah* does not act as a "weltlich" king – even if we suppose a certain degree of "secularization" in his age. – The king in Judah always retained the quality of "sacral king". It is true that Deut. does not intend to be what we call a "state law", but a law for a sacral community. But I have the feeling that *Noth* here introduces the modern secular state in OT times. The OT state was never what we call a "state", a secular state. The contrast which *Noth* thinks extant between Israelite and Judaic "states" and the "amphictyony" "Israel" must to a great extent be imaginary. The "state" in Israel,



as in all the Ancient East, was always a congregation. In reality we therefore cannot advance the question "State laws or sacral laws?" We may – as was done in previous paragraphs – distinguish between laws concerning the cult, and laws concerning civic life of the people. In that sense we may talk of "sacral" and "profane" laws, although the word "profane" may mislead people who do not read with the proper attention.

*Literature:* G. R. Driver and Miles, *The Assyrian Laws* (1935). An older edition by Scheil (1921), with French translation. German translation by Ehelolf, *Ein altassyrisches Rechtsbuch* (1929). Norwegian translation by Lie (1923). – Eilers, *Die Gesetzesstele Chammurabis* (1932). *Kapelrud*, *Hammurapis lov* (1943 – Norwegian). – *Ras Shamra* texts in Bauer's handy edition (cf. above, p. 221, n. 1). *Zimmermann and Friedrich* have translated the Hittite laws in AO vol. 23 (1922). *Hrozný*, *Code Hittite* (1922). – Cf. also Lipit-Ištar's and Bilalama of Ešnunna's Laws. On the latter: *Miles and Gurney*, in *Symbolae...* Hrozný, II, pp. 174ff. – Most texts in AOT and in *Pritchard*, *Near Eastern Texts*.

*Alt*, *Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts* (1933). *Jirku*, *Das weltliche Recht im AT* (1927). *Mowinkel*, *Le Décalogue* (1927); *Zur Geschichte der Dekaloge*, ZATW 1937, pp. 218ff. *Powis Smith*, *The Origin and History of Hebrew Law* (1931). *Horst*, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes* (1930). *Johs. Pedersen*, in *Studier tilegnede Frants Buhl* (1925), pp. 199ff. *Östborn*, cf. p. 213, n. 4. – *H. Cazelles*, *Études sur le Code de l'Alliance* (1946).

In Ehelolf's book, cf. above, *Koschaker* (pp. 12ff.) makes a distinction between "laws" promulgated by acts of legislation, and unofficial "Books of Law", composed by "lawyers" on the base of legal practice.

Cf. also *Berggrav*, *Ret og Religion* (i Kirke og Kultur, 1941). *Wheeler Robinson*, *Inspiration and Revelation in the OT* (1946), pp. 198ff.

### *Narratives.*

The first part of the OT which we have learnt to appreciate enshrines the inimitable narratives still brought to the minds of our children at home and at school.

OT narrative material is sometimes divided into two large groups. The principle of division then is the degree of *credibility*. *Eissfeldt* in his Introduction distinguishes between *poetical* and *historical* narratives. But he admits<sup>1)</sup> that this is a modern distinction, not familiar to the original narrators and hearers. They have – just like our children – regularly and unreflectively – regarded narratives which we call "poetical" as "historical". Further we must add that an "historical" narrative is very often imbued with pure poetry, and historiography never can get life without imagination. We had therefore better drop this distinction. *Eissfeldt* says that the different attitude towards the world, the poetic and the historical, is fundamental to narrators and hearers even though they are not conscious of it. But this more than anything proves the artificiality of the distinction.

<sup>1)</sup> p. 33.



*Hylmö* distinguishes between "popular prose-fiction" and "historiography". This might seem more appropriate. But when under the first group he registers "priestly legends with propagandistic tendencies"<sup>1)</sup>, then it is revealed that the adjective "popular" at any rate is no appropriate word in this connection, priestly legends being "learned" polemic literature. Similar considerations may be advanced concerning the myth.<sup>2)</sup>

Accordingly it appears to be simpler only to speak of the *narrative-types of prose-literature* including also historiography and related phenomena<sup>3)4)</sup>.

In this literature as in other fields we also encounter much mixed, and also non-Israelite material, of common Oriental, Canaanite origin. In many cases we may suppose that *poetry*, the divine language, the verse, has been the predecessor of prose. *Hylmö* e.g. refers to Ex. 17,16; 15,21, and Gen. 25,32 as proving that the narratives have grown out of heroic poems, a hymn or an oracle; and he quotes the story of the Flood which notoriously has a Babylonian poem as its base.

The arrangement of different *types* of narratives is difficult. This is especially the case when the distinction between "legend", "fairy tale", and "historical narrative" is established by criteria based upon the "credibility" of the tale in question. *Hylmö*<sup>5)</sup> has rightly pointed out that in deciding the category of a narrative the "credibility" is too vague as criterion<sup>6)</sup>. It is better to start from *purely formal points of view*. Other scholars refer to the characteristic feature of the "legend" (*sagn*), that it is originally *short*. We speak of the "legend"

<sup>1)</sup> p. 131.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 33ff.

<sup>3)</sup> Saying so we must stress the fact that *we have no great poetic epical literature, no verse-narratives like the Homeric poems or Paradise Lost, in the OT*. The attempts to read *Genesis* or *Samuel* or other historical books as verse have not been crowned with success. There have been several attempts of this kind. The master of modern Hebrew metrics, *Sievers*, has made great efforts in this direction. In Sweden, *Arvid Bruno* tried to reconstruct "Das hebräische Epos" (1935), cf. *Eissfeldt's* review, *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* 1936, p. 1,231f. *Procksch*, in his well-known commentary on *Genesis*, also finds rhythm in the legends. Nothing seems to favour these theories.

<sup>4)</sup> A great difficulty in the present paragraphs is the *question of terminology*. The Danish and German terms "*sagn*" and "*Sage*" and "*Legende*" as English equivalent have only one word: "*Legend*". Complicating the matter is the Swedish terminology in *Hylmö's* work, where other, and very similar, words are used in meaning differing from the Danish-Norwegian-German terms.

In the following pages I shall use the English "*legend*" in the meaning of Danish "*sagn*". The special type called in Danish "*Legende*" I shall mark by means of a defining adjective added to the English "legend": "*devotional*" or "*edificatory legend*".

<sup>5)</sup> p. 119.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. *Olrik*, below, p. 234, n.3.

being "one-episodic", and say that its aim is not only to entertain, but also to *instruct*; that generally it has an "historical nucleus": an event or a person to be remembered, or some phenomenon to be explained. On the other hand, the *hero-legend* – which is no special type, formally<sup>1)</sup> – is long, "many-episodic", and in this respect related to the "fairy-tale", the aim of which, however, is solely to *entertain*. Among "fairy-tales" we distinguish between the "chimerical fairy-tale", frequent among the Indo-Germanic peoples, and the "short story fairy-tale", predominant among the Semites. The first category we know from our stories of giants, ogres, enchanted princesses, and other phantastic figures, while the other kind has a more "realistic" shape, looking more like "true story".

As a special type is often registered a narrative called in the Scandinavian and other languages "*legende*" supposed to be characterized by its dealing with *sacred subjects*, in contrast to the common "legend" ("sagn"). This distinction has also been pronounced unsatisfactory by *Hylmø*. The ordinary "legend" ("sagn") may also speak of sacred themata. Again we have to underline that the distinction must be founded upon purely formal, stylistic criteria: "Legend" in this special meaning signifies a narrative told in an *edificatory style*. We shall therefore use the term "devotional" or "edificatory legend" (cf. p. 233, n. 4). It makes *propaganda* for some religious opinion or form of life,<sup>2)</sup>. This is never the case with a normal "legend" ("sagn"). As soon as we find "tendency" in a "legend" we may conclude that it has not come down to us in original form, but has been worked upon by later hands. Tendency never comes from original "legends", but appears e.g. in the *cycles of traditions* formed by combination of originally individual legends<sup>3)</sup>.

*Literature*: A bibliography is given in *H. Ellekilde's* edition of *Olrik's* posthumous, unfinished work (see below!).

*Aarne*: Verzeichnis der Märchentypen (1910). *Bethe*, *Mythus*, *Sage*, *Märchen* (1922). *Krohn*, *Die folkloristische Arbeitsmethode* (1926). *Liestøl*, *Upphavet til den islandske ættesaga* (1929). *von Sydow*, *Kategorien der Prosa-Volksdichtung* (in: *Volkstümliche Gaben*, *J. Meier* dargebracht (1934)). *J. C. Jacobsen*, *Gammeltestamentlige Sagn* (in: *Gads*

<sup>1)</sup> *Olrik*, p. 37 (cf. below, p. 237).

<sup>2)</sup> *Olrik*, p. 36 (cf. below, pp. 237ff.).

<sup>3)</sup> Very important for the understanding of legends are the works of *Axel Olrik*. His famous article: *Episke love i folkedigtningen* (in *Danske Studier* 1908, pp. 69–89) has been re-edited in his posthumous, unfinished book: *Nogle grundsætninger for sagnforskning*, udg. af *Hans Ellekilde* (1921). – The Danish edition of my book contained a lengthy account of this work of *Olrik*. The main ideas of *Olrik* have been presented in *German* by himself in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 1909, pp. 1ff. My quotations are from the Danish book of 1921.



Danske Magasin 1934, p. 153ff., with an important short bibliography). *Widengren*, *Religionens värld* (1945), p. 134f. *Hocart*, in: *the Labyrinth*, ed. by S. H. Hooke, p. 276; *Malinowski*, *Myth in Primitive Psychology* (1926). *Levy-Bruhl*, *La Mythologie Primitive* (1935). *A. van Gemep*, *La Formation des Legendes* (1910), cf. my: *Det sakrale kongedømme*, pp. 14ff. – Cf. also articles by *Nyberg*, in *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*, ed. by *Engnell* and *Fridrichsen*, on *Abraham*, *Isak*.

### Ætiological Legends.

The OT contains many ætiological legends. In many cases they are *local legends* explaining the origin of some local phenomenon. In this manner we have to understand the legends of the destruction of *Sodom and Gomorrah*, and e.g. the original legend of the Flood, transferred from Mesopotamia to the mountain country of Palestine where it has no "geological" foundation at all<sup>1</sup>). A legend of similar kind, local ætiology, is the story of the kings imprisoned in the cave at *Makkeedah* (Jos. 10). The starting point for the formation of the legend (its "*historical nucleus*") is the cave and some curious heaps of stones outside which aroused the wonder of the people in the neighbourhood<sup>2</sup>). Characteristic is the legend explaining the origin of the place-name *Ramath-lehi* (Judg. 15,9–17). Here probably a height, the form of which reminded people of the jawbone of an ass (*Ramath-lehi*, "The Jaw-Height"), is re-interpreted as "the Throw of the Jaw", because it was told that *Samson* had "thrown" the jawbone of an ass by which he killed 1000 men away here (*Rāmāt*, "height", being understood by means of a pun, alluding to the verb *rāmāh*, "to throw"). – Following this story we have, in v. 18–19, a similar legend of the origin of a *source*. This legend, and similar stories, such as the explanation of the names of *Penuel* (Gen. 32,31), *Beer-lahai-roi* (Gen. 16,14), or *Succoth* (Gen. 33,17), should perhaps not be called "nature-legends", but rather be classified with an extensively known group of *etymological local legends*. Many of the legends centred around *Kadesh Barnea* and *Sinai* are probably also such "nature legends" and "etymological legends", especially the legends of the sources at *Massah*, *Meribah* and *Marah* (Ex. 17,7; 15,22ff.).

Such local legends not only deal with forms of landscape and etymologies of names, but also with *remnants of culture* in the country. We may mention Deut. 3,11, the *sarcophagus of king Og*, Judg. 13, 25 and 18,12, the *camp of Dan*. To the same category belongs probably the legend of the conquest of *Jericho* and certainly that of the conquest of *Ai*<sup>3</sup>). In the latter case, at any rate, there

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Hempel*, in RGG, 2nd ed. s.v. *Sintflut* I, where the historical events behind the legend are stressed, but elements warning against apologetic abuse are also underlined.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. the commentary of *Noth*.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Noth*. PJB 1935.



cannot be any historical reminiscences of a real Israelite conquest of the site behind the story, the town having been destroyed many centuries earlier than the immigration of the tribes of Joseph and Benjamin. But "historical nuclei" are probably to be found in the neighbouring landscape and in the "Heap of Ruins" (*ha-Ai*) itself.

A sub-division of local legends is provided by *sanctuary-legends*. Several of the previously mentioned examples belong to this class: e.g. those associated with the Sinai-peninsula, of *Beer-lahai-roi*, *Massah*, *Meribah* and *Marah*, places which most probably have been sanctuaries (Ex. 15,25). Several legends of this kind have certainly been taken over from the *Canaanite sanctuaries* to which they originally belonged. Sometimes the former *name* of the sanctuary has been omitted, but can be traced in *puns* hinting at it (Gen. 22,14, cf. vv. 8,12,22)<sup>1</sup>). The same follows from the inconsistency between the place-name *Bethel*, *Bet-El*, and the motivation in Gen. 28,19 not speaking of the Canaanite *El*, but of the Israelite *Yahweh*. The later Israelite story teller has introduced the name of the God of Israel in place of the *El* of the original legend. Generally Israel has accounted for the possession of the Palestinian sanctuaries by declaring them to have been discovered through theophanies granted to the ancestors of the people or other of its heroes, or that the fathers had founded the sanctuary, built the altar, erected the massebah etc., instituted sacred customs like the giving of tithes: Gen. 12,6f.; 28,18ff.; Jos. 24,25; 5,2; 5,15; Judg. 6,11-24; 2 Sam. 24, cf. also Ex. 3,1ff.: The discovery by Moses of the Sinai sanctuary, and Deut. 33,16 where *Yahweh* is called "him that dwelt in the bush", *šōknī s'ēnē*.

We also find legends explaining the *origins of usage in daily life and cult*. The legend of the wrestling of *Jacob* with God does not only explain the name of *Peniel*, but also an Israelite *food-taboo* (Gen. 32,33). The same species is also represented in the story explaining the respect for the threshold of the temple among the priests of *Dagon* (2 Sam. 5,5, LXX). The origin of *sacred objects*, too, is explained by such legends, e.g. the *brazen serpent* in the temple of Jerusalem (Num. 21,4ff.; 2 Ki. 18,4). Both behind Gen. 18,1ff. and the parallel Judg. 6,11-24 we probably have legends of sanctuaries<sup>2</sup>). Especially Judg. 6,11-24 seem to contain distinct hints of the *sacrificial customs* at *Ophrah* (v. 20). The following legend of *Jerubbaal's* destruction of the altar of *Baal* (v. 25-32), on the other hand, is a *religious hero-legend* (devotional legend, cf. above<sup>3</sup>) of the contest

<sup>1</sup>) cf. the commentary of Gunkel, and the Norwegian translation by Michelet, *Mo-winkel*, and Messel I, ad. loc. <sup>2</sup>) cf. Gunkel, on Gen. 18. On "Denkmalnovelle" or "Bild-sage", see Baumgartner, *Symb. ... Hrozny* ded. III, p. 91. <sup>3</sup>) p. 233f.

against Baal, perhaps from the time of *Ahab*. Its ætiological element (v. 32) explains the double name of Gideon. But its cultural background permits us to fix its date approximately.

Among the ætiological legends we finally have to register several stories dealing with the *history of tribes and nations*, especially from Genesis (*tribal legends*), e.g. the *Cain*-legend (Gen. 4), the *lists of nations* (Gen. 10 and 11), the *Hagar-Ishmael*-legends of Gen. 16 and 21, the first of which also contains a sanctuary-legend. Further we mention the legend of *Noah's curse* (Gen. 9), *Isaac's blessing* of Jacob and Esau (Gen. 27), and *Jacob's benediction* of the sons of Joseph (Gen. 48).

These legends, however, are transitional links to the *hero legend* known from the stories of Israel's leaders in the Book of *Judges* and some of the stories of *Saul* and *David*. Some of the stories of *Moses* perhaps also have to be mentioned here. The *ætiological element* appears in legends of this sort in their attempts to explain e.g. the subjugation of the Canaanites by the curse of *Noah* (Gen. 9) or *Edom's* dependence on Israel through Jacob's buying his birthright (Gen. 25, 29ff.). In like manner Gen. 34 perhaps originally was intended to explain the origin of the dispersion of the tribes Simeon and Levi, cf. Gen. 49, 5ff. The story of *Abraham's* sacrifice (Gen. 22) is very complex. It has an element of sanctuary legend; it accounts for the custom of substitution-sacrifice for the human sacrifice; and it has something of the devotional legend in its description of Abraham's piety.

### Devotional Legends

By "devotional legends" we<sup>1)</sup> understand stories with *religious tendency and edifying form*. They generally deal with *holy persons*, pious men and women, prophets or sages. In the OT such legends mostly come from *Jewish* circles after the exile. But some *pre-exilic* stories of prophets may be counted among the examples of this type, e.g. a great part of the narratives of *Elijah* and *Elisha* in 1 Ki. 17-19 and 2 Ki. 1-8, cf. also 1 Ki. 13-14 and part of the *Isaiah*-legends in Is. 36-39. We also have numbered one of the *Gideon* stories among them.<sup>2)</sup>

Many of these legends breathe the sound and strong spirit of the stories of ancient days. In quite another, more solemn style the legends of e.g. *Daniel* are told: Like Gen. 14 they in some places seem to be influenced by the style of learned historians<sup>3)</sup>. These later devotional legends often show a strong propensity to embroider the description with particulars making the picture of

<sup>1)</sup> p. 233. — Steinmann, Daniel (1950), calls such stories *Haggada*.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. above, p. 236.

<sup>3)</sup> Hylmö, p. 129.



milieu and of history a chaos of features borrowed from different times and cultures, e.g. the catalogues of official titles in Dan. and the beginning of the Book of Judith<sup>1</sup>). This probably also explains the list of royal names in Gen. 14.

One of the peculiar forms of the devotional legend is the *martyr legend*. The original meaning of "martyr" is "blood-witness". Legends of this kind, telling of the martyr-death of the hero, are not found in the OT Canon, but in Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (2 Macc. 6-7; cf. 4 Macc. 5f. and 8-12; Martyr. Is.<sup>2</sup>). But if "martyr" is understood in the wider meaning of "confessor", i.e. a man keeping his faith in spite of persecutions and sufferings, then some canonical stories deserve the name "martyr legends", e.g. Dan. 1 and 3 and 6: Here we find the characteristic *edificatory language* of devotional legends, even in the mouth of a pagan king; further the inclination for *miracles*, often very gross miracles, and the moral, religious and intellectual and even warlike *superiority of the hero*. A form of martyr legend is also the story of *David and Goliath*: David here acts as confessor over against the boasting pagan just as the three friends of Daniel towards Nebuchadnezzar.<sup>3</sup>).

*Priest-legends* are stories fighting for the privileges of the priests. They are devotional propaganda. Often they have something of the character of *etiological legend* or of the *hadith*-like stories which are in reality laws<sup>4</sup>). They are frequent in the descriptions of the priesthood of the Priestly source in the Pentateuch, e.g. Lev. 9, 1ff.; Num. 16-17, cf. also 2 Chron. 26, 16ff. and 1 Sam. 2, 27ff. In such stories we catch glimpses of the contests of the priests with competing forces, chiefs, kings, and people in their own class. They here are the "martyrs" prevailing in spite of the politics of their competitors.<sup>5</sup>) Among the priestly legends *Hylmō* also counts Gen. 14, culminating in Abraham's giving of tithes to the priest-king *Melchizedek*. Abraham here also experiences a sort of martyr passion: his heroic effort to rescue Lot and his noble refraining from keeping anything of the booty.

More popular, though with regard to the political and historical events no more reliable than the previously mentioned types of devotional legends, are the *legends of prophets*. While the priestly legends often have a strong savour of priestly egotism, the prophetic legends, of which we have a great many in the OT, generally are more genuinely edifying. They crystallize around the great prophetic figures, but also now and then around anonymous men of God

<sup>1</sup>) cf. II.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Hylmō*, p. 129.

<sup>3</sup>) p. 240, cf. p. 166, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. p. 222.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. my *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie* (1931).



(1 Ki. 12,33-13,32). Mainly in the post-canonical period the great reforming prophets are the subject of devotional legends (Mart. Is.; 2 Macc. 15,13-16). But an early form we find in the *Isaiah*-legends from about 587<sup>1)</sup>, explaining why Yahweh in 587 acted otherwise than in 701 towards the Holy City. – In the old days it is mostly *Samuel*, *Elijah*, and *Elisha* who are central figures of devotional legends. *Hylmō*<sup>2)</sup> places also the *Book of Jonah* in the class of prophetic devotional legends. But then its form is peculiar. For the hero is here not exalted, but rebuked and instructed by God.

The legends of *Samuel* have been especially formed by the *Deuteronomic* school. This is clearly seen in 1 Sam. 7,2-8,22; 10,17-27; 12, where Samuel occupies a nearly princely position completely at variance with history. The language has the edificatory character of Deuteronomistic admonition.

Of the same kind are the *Ahijah*-legends in 1 Ki. 11,29-39 and 14,1-18. As in the case of the *Samuel* stories we are here able to control the relations of the stories to historical fact. The description of the origin of kingship in the *Samuel* stories is quite unhistorical, and the same holds true of the disruption of the kingdom in the *Ahijah*-legends as a religiously motivated event.<sup>3)</sup>

The stories of *Elijah* and *Elisha* are of mixed character. *Hylmō*<sup>4)</sup> is inclined to put them in the class of the *hero-legends* in spite of certain features pointing to the devotional story. But he has fixed his eyes too much on certain unsympathetic elements of devotional legends and he is too inclined to stress the unhistorical features in these products. In reality the devotional legend is a form of *hero-legend* with strong religious accent. This is at least true of the martyr- and the prophet-legends, while the priest-legends are sometimes related to the ætiological stories. *Hylmō* is right in pointing out that there is a difference between 1 Ki. 18,21; 2 Ki. 8-9 on the one hand, and 1 Ki. 17,2-6,7-16; 2 Ki. 1,2-17; 2,23-25; 4,38-41; 6,1-7 on the other. But is not the real difference only that the first group shows the hero vis-à-vis the great events of history and in essential contact with them, so that we may believe that we are facing relatively good historical tradition; while the second belongs to the class of more popular miracle stories? How closely related the two forms are we perceive in the story of the miraculous sacrifice on Mount Carmel only differing from 2 Ki. 1,2-7 through the grandness of the story and the historical importance of the matter. And 1 Ki. 19, the visit of the prophet to the Holy Mountain of Horeb, by *Hylmō* called a devotional legend, is just as grand as ch. 18 or 21. Form and

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Hempel*, *Althebr. Lit.*, 148.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 132.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Hylmō*, pp. 133-34.

<sup>4)</sup> p. 134.

tendency are the same. We perceive that the "devotional" character does not mean a drawback – which often seems to be the opinion of *Hylmö* when he compares the devotional legends of later Judaism with the old stories.

It is no peculiarity of this material that it may *migrate* from one person to another (1 Ki. 17,17, cf. 2 Ki. 4,18, and the fairy-tale motive of the helpful animals in 1 Ki. 17,7 and 2 Ki. 2,23–25). In the same manner legend has transferred the heroic act, the slaying of *Goliath*, from *Elhanan* of Bethlehem (2 Sam. 21,19) to *David* (1 Sam. 17). The latter chapter might well be reckoned among the devotional legends on account of its strong edifying tendency. David here is described as "witness", "confessor", of the strength of faith against the faith in material, human power and technique (v. 45). The story is a legend of the pious layman, to be compared to the martyr legends of 2 Macc. 7. Another early form of this type we have in Judg. 6,25–32, the Gideon-Jerubbaal legend. To the same class, but perhaps not as martyr but as hero-legend of layfolk, it might be tempting to reckon novellettes like *Ruth*, *Esther*, and *Judith*, if they were not better classified as "historical novels"<sup>1)</sup>.

Special attention must be paid to the *stories of the childhood of the hero*. In the OT they are represented by the legends of the birth and growth of *Moses*. Two features appear in such stories: The *perils* threatening his life, and the *glory*, early bestowed upon him. These motives we meet in many places of the world, as shown by *Gressmann* in his book *Mose und seine Zeit* (1914). The best known parallels are probably the devotional legends of Mt. 2: the stories of the *Magi*, the murder of the Innocents, and the migration to and return from Egypt of Mary and Joseph.

### Fairy-Tales.

The fairy-tale occurs mainly in two types, mentioned previously: the "chimeric" and the "short story-fairy-tale"<sup>2)</sup>. We noted that the Semitic peoples seem to have had no inclination for the first of these classes. *Hylmö*<sup>3)</sup> maintains that this antipathy towards the chimeric story has been reinforced in Israel, where its view of the world, its animation of nature had no favourable conditions on account of the theistic accent on the divine omnipotence and justice. But the contention that the Semitic peoples did not favour the chimeric tale must not be exaggerated. That Israel has been acquainted with it can be

<sup>1)</sup> cf. below, p. 265.

<sup>2)</sup> on the terminology, cf. p. 234.

<sup>3)</sup> The Swedish term is "saga", not to be confounded with the usage in Danish-Norwegian-Icelandic, where this word denotes a "history-narrative".

seen from the existence of a great many motives of this kind. As example *Hylmö* quotes Gen. 32,23ff.: the possibility of *constraint being exercised against the deity*, further the motive of *betting* in Job 1-2, the "*Iphigenia motive*" in the legend of *Jephthah's* daughter (Judg. 11), and the similar motive in Gen. 22; the *magic staff* motive, the power of the *wish*, used to glorify Yahweh and the power of his prophets (Ex. 7-8; 1 Ki. 17,7ff.; 2 Ki. 4,1ff.), *animal motives* like the *speaking serpent* (Gen. 3), the *speaking ass* (Num. 22,28ff.), *helpful animals*, animals which *swallow men* and spit then out again (the Book of Jonah), remnants of vegetation-tales in the ideas of miraculous trees (Gen. 2-3; Num. 17; Jonah 4). More motives are registered by *Gunkel* in his book quoted below.

"Short-story-tales" we especially encounter in the narratives of *Jacob* and *Esau* (Gen. 24-33) and in the *Joseph-story* (Gen. 37 and 39ff.). But nowhere in the OT we find *pure fairy-tales*, only a strong conjunction with legendary elements and perhaps with historical reminiscences. The same short-story-character as e.g. in the *Joseph-story* we find in the narratives of *Ruth*, *Esther*, and *Judith*, and likewise in *Tobit*. In the latter we also find the fairy-tale motive of "the grateful dead", also known from *Andersen's* story of "The traveller's companion". But in these historical novels (cf. above) the connections with the devotional legend are also obvious.

Whether it is possible from this background to trace lines back to *international material*, is disputed. There is an obvious connection between the story of *Joseph and Potiphar's wife* and an *Egyptian tale*<sup>1)</sup>, and to the story of *Solomon's judgment* there is a well-known parallel from *India*<sup>2)</sup>. Both motives are found in many places of the world, and a connection seems very probable. But in other cases we must take into account that parallels exist in parts of the world so remote from one another that their inhabitants seem to have had no possibility of intercourse. - Behind Is. 14,4ff. *Hildegard Lewy* sees folk-traditions of *Nabonid*<sup>3)</sup>.

### Myths.

Formally the myth is no independent literary type. It is generally to be described as a legend dealing with *divine persons*, moving in what we call "supra-natural" environment. It generally presupposes *polytheism* and accordingly has not had favourable conditions in Israel. The religious history of Israel is in some respects a history of "de-mythologization". In the OT therefore, according to the general opinion, we only meet *remnants* and *adaptations* of mythological material. In later *Judaism* the mythological elements seem to have had

<sup>1)</sup> A parallel from Northern Syria (Idrimi), BASOR, April 1950, p. 20. - *Bo Reicke*, in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1945, traces a vegetation ritual behind the story of *Joseph*.

<sup>2)</sup> *Gressmann*, in SAT II, 1, p. 198. *Gunkel*, *Das Märchen im AT*, pp. 144ff.

<sup>3)</sup> in *Symbolae ... Hrozny* ded. II (1949), but cf. my article "Der böse Fürst", in *Studia Theologica* IV, 2.



a renaissance in the Pseudepigrapha. The primeval story of Genesis contains many mythological features, but also, in the story of the flood, some historical elements resting on a catastrophe in Babylonia, which however had already in the old Gilgamesh poem developed into a legend of gods and a world-wide flood, a motive found all over the world, but not always dependent upon the same source. *Hylmö*<sup>1)</sup> therefore prefers to call the primeval legends "mythical legends".

Dispersed in the books of poets and prophets we find many mythical remnants, e.g. mythical beings like *Cherubs* (Ez. 1,1ff. etc.), *Seraphs* (Is. 6), the *seven gods of the planets* (Ez. 9,2), or *4 gods of the winds* (Zech. 6,1ff.), the *Morning Star* (Is. 14,12ff.), the *Son of God*<sup>2)</sup> (Ez. 28,12ff. – an older variant of the Paradise story), cf. Job. 15,7. In Ez. 31 and Dan. 4 we meet the myth of the *Tree of the World*<sup>3)</sup>. The myths of *Creation* form the background not only of Gen. 1–2, but also of the psalms to the accession festival of Yahweh and the passages in the prophets, especially Deutero-Isaiah, dependent upon these psalms, cf. Is. 51,9ff.; Ps. 89,10; Job 26,12; Ez. 29,3ff.; Ps. 104,4ff. Features from myths of *Paradise* are used to describe not only the dawn of time, but also the *Messianic age* (Is. 11,9; 65,17–25), and *Chaos* myths also are adapted to depict the eschatological catastrophe (Jer. 4,23; Is. 24,18). In Ps. 48,2f, Is. 2 and Micah 4, Is. 14,13, Ez. 28,14ff. we find the idea of the mythical *mountain of the gods*.

Most of this material must have been imported into Israel viâ the *Canaanites*. The Ras Shamra tablets teach us many of these things. Modern research stresses the connection between *myth and ritual*: The myths are stories explaining the rites enacted in the *sacred dramas* of the great festivals. Above all the *creation drama* of the *New Year Festival* has been of great importance in the whole Ancient Near East, and through the medium of Canaan it has also gained a firm footing in Israel. Traces of this have also been found in the OT, especially in the Psalms, and literature depending upon them, such as Deutero-Isaiah. But research is here only in its beginnings. The ritual interpretation of poems and narratives must be attempted. Coming years – if we get time for it! – will set us a task here to be carried out diligently and critically, lest wild phantasy leads us astray. We must always keep before our eyes the warning not to find "Helena in jedem Weibe".

*Literature:* The introductory chapters of Gunkel's commentary on Genesis. Olrik (cf. above, p. 234, n. 3). His Nogle grundsætninger for sagnforskning contains an analysis of the stories of Jacob in Gen., showing that he does not feel any inconsistency in combining his

<sup>1)</sup> p. 138.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. my Det sakrale kongedømme, p. 117.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. my commentary on Dan. 4.

folkloristic method with that of literary criticism (the documentary hypothesis). *Eissfeldt*, *Stammesgeschichte und Novelle in den Geschichten von Jakob und seinen Söhnen* (1922). *Eising*, *Formgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Jakobserzählung* (1940). *Gressmann*, *Das salomonische Urteil* (Deutsche Rundschau 1907, pp. 175ff.); *Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzählungen* (ZATW 1910), *Gunkel*, *Das Märchen im AT* (1917). On *Myths*: *Hocart* in *The Labyrinth*, ed. Hooke, p. 276; *Malinowski* (cf. above p. 235). *Lévy-Bruhl*, (cf. above p. 235), pp. 259ff.; *van Gennep* (above p. 235), p. 111. *Widengren*, *Religionens värld*, p. 134f. *My*: *Det sakrale kongedømme*. – On *Myth and Ritual*, see also *Frankfort*, in *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man* (1948), pp. 6ff. – *Kapellrud*, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts* (1952). *Van der Leeuw*, in the *Bertholet-Festschrift* (1950), pp. 287ff. – *C. R. North*, *Isaiah 40–55* (1952), pp. 26ff.

### History-narrative and historiography.

Historiography in Israel develops from the realm of legends and is never completely disengaged from it.<sup>1)</sup> It is unanimously acknowledged that Israel's historiography like its prophecy is superior to parallel phenomena in the Ancient Near East. *Lindblom*<sup>2)</sup> points out that old Oriental chronicles never attain the heights of the best Israelite books of the same kind, such as the story of *David and his sons* in 2 Sam.–1 Ki., or the memorial book of *Nehemiah* or the biography of *Jeremiah* contained in the story-telling chapters of the book bearing his name. And he stresses that not until centuries later does *Greece* present us the beginnings of real historical research. Critical historiography is not found in the OT<sup>3)</sup>.

*History-writing* must from the beginning have been "literature" in the "literal" sense of the word. It presupposes the knowledge of writing, i.e. learning. It may contain legend, but in that case we have to deal with legend fixed in written form, not primitive legends, incorporated in historiography. But we must not suppose that what we think of as historiography has from the beginning been written history. The old story of David and his sons just alluded to may well have begun as orally delivered tale.

Historiography, and its predecessor, the orally delivered history, further presupposes a certain amount of *culture*, and above all that a nation is living through a *history so important that it is deemed necessary to keep the memory of it alive* in later generations. The nation must experience things worth telling. It seems to have been the great age of *David* which aroused men and led them into the work of telling and writing history<sup>4)</sup>. Here we at once perceive that the

<sup>1)</sup> Another "primitive cell" might be found in the *genealogical list* which perhaps has some connection with the cultic community.

<sup>2)</sup> *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift* (1935).

<sup>3)</sup> *Meyer*, *Gesch. des Altertums II*, 2 (1931), p. 109.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. p. 244.



results are at a level very seldom attained later. The description of the family history of David (the so-called "story of succession"<sup>1)</sup>) in 2 Sam. 9-20; 1 Ki. 1-2 is superior to everything which we know. But in connection with this narrative must be mentioned pieces like Judg. 8,4-27; 9; 1 Sam. 11,1-15 and 13-14, all rising above the legendary material through their thoroughly realistic description of earthly events without miraculous character. The same characteristics we find in the "story of succession", the story of *Ahab* (1 Ki. 20-22), of *Jehu's* revolution (2 Ki. 9-10), and in the late 1 *Macc.*

This historiography or history-telling is no dry as dust registering of facts. It is an *art*. It does not give substantiation and verification by means of documents. It presents *perspicuous situations*, like legend. We perhaps – as already hinted at – ought to speak of orally delivered history. But its fixed form makes the narratives look like writings<sup>2)</sup>. We get no psychological pictures of the soul of the acting persons. The inner life of the men and women brought on the stage reveals itself in dialogues and acts. The *epic laws* of legend we meet again, e.g. the *law of contrast*: Two figures are placed over against one another as representatives of different forms of life. The story develops towards a culmination, but *retarding scenes* may be interposed. When Israel's history-narrative is at its best, it comes very near to the most vividly told legends.

As said above, Israel's history-telling presupposes *events* inspiring memory. Judg. 9 is no legend, but told, or written – that is here irrelevant – probably by a man representing the tendencies inimical to kingship. This is expressed through the *Fable of Jotham* forming a high-light-point of the narrative<sup>3)</sup>. Likewise the description of *David's* history before his accession to the throne (1 Sam. 16,4-2; Sam. 5,23) is probably a defence of David against Saul. It is not historiography without "*tendency*". The narrators have obviously been moved by events and opinions. Most "objective" the "story of the succession" seems to be, with its picture of David revealing both faults and force, where it is difficult to say that the author is defending the king. It looks as if his aim is only to remember his sovereign, great, both in virtue and vice, but nevertheless a great king.

When we said above that the *miraculous element* is not found in this old narrative it does not mean that it is an *irreligious* story. The old story tellers did not distinguish as we do between "miraculous" and "natural". The events recorded in the "history of succession", culminating in the description of David's "blessing", his happiness asserting itself through all perils and faults of his own, may

<sup>1)</sup> Rost's expression in his monograph.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. above p. 105.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. my: Det sakrale kongedømme, p. 120.



have been felt by narrators and hearers, writers and readers, as just as "miraculous" as the story of the crossing of the Red Sea, or the narrative of the sacrifice on Mount Carmel. The narrative is dominated by the notion of *Yahweh directing the course of events*<sup>1)</sup>, cf. 2 Sam. 11,27; 12,23; 15,25f.; 17,14; 1 Ki. 2,44f.<sup>2)</sup>. It is inspired by faith in Providence, not in "miracle"<sup>3)</sup>.

It seems to be a fact that historiography in Israel began with eminent works of this kind, by men recording unworried by the opinions of other people, telling freely in the best form of legend and saga. It is also evident that this history-telling at an early date was displaced by the *court historiographers*. We know of an official historiography<sup>4)</sup>. The kings of pre-Israelite Canaan had their *books* in which the *acts of their ancestors* were written. This is a very important fact to be taken into account in the present discussion of the significance of oral tradition<sup>5)</sup>. Allusion is made to books of this kind in the story of the voyage of *Wen Amon*<sup>6)</sup>: The prince of Byblos "had the journal of his fathers brought in, and he had them read it before me". When the author of the *Book of Kings* from the time of Solomon onwards (1 Ki. 11,41) refers to the *histories of the kings*, both of *Israel* and *Judah*, he must know these "*annals*", carried up to date by officials appointed for this work. We know of literature of this kind both from *Egypt* and *Babylonia*, cf. also the description from a Persian milieu, Esth. 6,1.

Similar books have been kept in *sanctuaries*. The excavations at *Ras Shamra* have shown that the temple had a school for scribes, like those found at other Oriental temples<sup>7)</sup>. The information given in the Book of Kings of the history of the temple at Jerusalem (1 Ki. 6-8; 2 Ki. 12,10-17; 22-23) may come from temple annals. The temple being the sanctuary of the king it may have had annals in common with the court<sup>8)</sup>.

Most of this material is gradually brought together in the great *works of history*. According to common opinion the first of these is the story of the *Yahwist* (J) which in spite of its character of a *compilation* has preserved much of

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Weiser*, p. 58.

<sup>2)</sup> Not all the passages quoted above are unanimously referred to the succession story by scholars (cf. the commentaries). But they are so uniform that the uncontested passages give us a right to quote also the uncertain.

<sup>3)</sup> *Mowinkel*, in the Norwegian translation of *Michelet*, *Mowinkel* and *Messel* II, p. 114.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. 248.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. above p. 106, n. 2.

<sup>6)</sup> Translation e.g. in *Barton*, *Archaeology and the Bible*, p. 448ff.

<sup>7)</sup> cf. above p. 171.

<sup>8)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 54.

the best in the old free story telling. With this work of the Yahwist the religious point of view, we may even say that of "church history", is introduced into the material. This tendency is reinforced by the *Elohist* (E), and reaches a culmination in the "*Deuteronomistic work of history*"<sup>1</sup>): Everything is here treated according to the criteria presented by the framework to the Book of Kings, resting on the ideas of the Law Book incorporated in Deuteronomy. And the story is carried on to the point where the punishment for the impiety of Israel and Judah appears to have reached its final measure. Then, in the last words of the II Book of Kings a flash of light and hope breaks through the dense darkness. New criteria, but the old methods, we then find when P (the Priestly source) is worked into the Pentateuch, and in the "*Chronistic work of history*" (Chron. + Ezra-Neh.). On the other hand, much of the fine style of the oldest histories again comes to light in *1 Macc.* But it is to a great extent due to *imitation*: *1 Macc.* writes on the pattern of the Book of Judges.

A special category in history telling and writing is the *autobiographical narrative*. How early it is known is not quite certain. *Eissfeldt*<sup>2</sup>) points to *inscriptions* from the tombs of high *Egyptian* officials dating from the first half of the 3rd millennium<sup>3</sup>). He also mentions the stories of *Sinuhe* and *Wen Amon* exhibiting the "I"-form like the story of *Ahikar*. The latter *Eissfeldt* combines with the "I"-form of the Wisdom teachers<sup>4</sup>). But with certainty he points to some "I-narratives" in the OT already occurring in oral tradition, viz. the *narratives of dreams and visions*. Both are connected with the *oracular* service. This accounts for the importance of this form for the development of the prophetic vision-narratives, especially the records of their *vocation* which get a sort of autobiographical character. The same is the case with those sections of which we hear that the prophets themselves took care to have them recorded in writing (Is. 30,8; 8,1-2; Jer. 36). The vision-narrative by and by, especially in Apocalyptic literature, develops into a purely literary form leaving its mark also in the composition of the books of the younger prophets, above all Ez.,

<sup>1</sup>) The problems of the "*documentary theory*" etc. will of course be dealt with in the Special Introduction (II). Till then I must postpone the examination of recent theories of *Noth* (Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I, in Schriften der Königsberger gelehrten Gesellschaft 1942) and *Engnell* (Gamla testamentet I). But so much can be said in advance: that it seems impossible to stop investigation without trying to account for the differences between the "P-material" in the narrower sense and the material from other traditions in a more thorough manner than that of *Engnell*. - Cf. *North*, in *The OT and Modern Study*, pp. 63ff.

<sup>2</sup>) p. 55. <sup>3</sup>) AOT, pp. 80-82. <sup>4</sup>) cf. p. 170.

<sup>5</sup>) AOT, pp. 80-82.

<sup>6</sup>) cf. p. 170.



Zech. 1-8, Dan. 7-12 and other Apocalypses. The *dates* given in these writings give them the appearance of autobiographical journals<sup>1)</sup>.

Another peculiar type appears in the Book of *Nehemiah*. The "I-narrative" in this book is no real autobiography. *Mowinkel*, in his book *Statholderen Nehemia* (1916), proved that the stylistic pattern comes from the *royal inscriptions* of Assyria and Babylonia. Their boisterous self-laudations are however moderated through the influence of the Jewish religion. The aim of the book is to keep alive in the thoughts of Yahweh the memory of the pious governor, not so much to speak to men of the present and future (Neh. 5, 19; 6, 9, 14; 13, 14, 22, 31). As a Persian court official with access to the harem Nehemiah was probably an eunuch<sup>2)</sup>, and so his memoirs, deposited in the temple, were destined to assure him that perpetuity of life ("name") which he could not get in his posterity (cf. Is. 56, 3-5).

Among the autobiographies many scholars also place the *Ezra*-narrative in the Book of Ezra (7-10) and Nehemiah (8ff.)). This story has also been examined by *Mowinkel* in the book parallel to the one just mentioned, *Ezra den skriftlærde* (1916). Here too he does not find a real autobiography, but thinks that the "I-form" in some sections of the narrative is a stylistic device used by the author, who was an eye-witness and admirer of Ezra. His work is no autobiography, but rather a devotional legend.

When we come to the *historical novel* or *short story* we enter a border-land. We have mentioned<sup>3)</sup> the stories of *Ruth*, *Esther*, and *Judith* and asked if they could be considered hero-legends. Their devotional tendency<sup>4)</sup> speaks in favour of this assumption. It is mostly their *size*, which joins them with the saga, and their *unhistorical* features which lead to the label "novels", perhaps also their obvious character of books of entertainment. This is very marked in *Tobit*, and it is probably an inheritance from the fairy-tale. They probably are not - like legend and devotional narrative - original oral tradition, but literature in the narrower sense. But they also *pretend to be historiography*. This is at least true of the book of *Esther*, with its dates, cf. also *Judith* and the legends of *Daniel*. It is probably learned mannerism influencing the devotional story<sup>5)</sup> aiming at giving it a more "historical" appearance. The devotional historical novel is a development of the common devotional legend.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, pp. 59ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Hölscher*, in *Kautzsch's* translation of the OT. 4th ed. II, p. 525, and LXX on 1, 1.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 240.

<sup>4)</sup> *Pfeiffer*, (JBL 1948, p. 401, cf. Harv. Div. School Bulletin) questions this in the case of *Esther*. In Jewish circles the Scroll of the Purim Festival certainly calls for devotion.

<sup>5)</sup> *Hylmö*, p. 129.



*Literature:* Gressmann, SAT II, 1,2 (1921), p. XI–XVIII. Gunkel, Geschichtsschreibung, in RGG, 2nd ed. Lindblom, Historieskrivningen i Israel och dess ställning inom forntidens hävdateckning, in Svensk Teologisk Kvartalsskrift 1935. Misch, Geschichte der Autobiographie (2nd ed. 1931). Hans Schmidt, Die Geschichtsschreibung im AT (1911). Mowinkel's two books on Ezra and Nehemia (cf. above); Hat es ein israelitisches National-epos gegeben? ZATW 1935, pp. 130ff. Egon Johannesen, Ezras og Nehemjas Historie (1946). Kapelrud, The Question of Authorship in the Ezra-Narrative (1944). Hölscher, Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung (1942). S. Granild, Ezrabogens litterære Genesis (1949).

### *Historiography, historiographers, and narrators.*

Dealing with the categories in the previous paragraphs we have occasionally touched the problem concerning the people behind them. We do not know much of the oldest poets. OT literature to a great extent is anonymous, and tradition concerning poets and authors generally late and unreliable.

The same holds good concerning *narratives*. The names of authors of later tradition (Moses, Joshua, Samuel etc.) are late unhistorical guessings<sup>1</sup>). But we can say something of the *circles* in which such works originated, at least as long as we limit ourselves to the greater complexes: That Chron. belongs to certain Levitical circles, the Deuteronomistic work to other Levites; that the Pentateuch has got its latest form under the hands of a priestly school etc. can be considered evident.

Greater difficulties arise when we come to the "sources" behind the great composite works. The *annals* behind part of Kings have been compiled at the royal court or in the temple. They have perhaps been looked after by the so-called *mazkir*, the "chancellor"<sup>2</sup>). Behind the "story of succession after David" in 2 Sam. we perceive a great contemporary history-teller, to a great extent an eye-witness, but of course not of all happenings in the story: He cannot have overheard quite private dialogues. Such features belong to the artistic element of the narrative. That the author is the priest *Abiathar* cannot be proved.

Especially concerning the older *strata* of the *Hexateuch*, J and E, the problem: individual authors or "schools" of story tellers? has become acute. The *Yahwist* (J) with the peculiar outlook has very often been regarded as the work of one man, not a collection set up by one or several compilers, as Gunkel thought. That this work has the character of being both a compilation and the work of one author seems to be the point of view counting most votes. But on the other hand, the products of the Deuteronomic school and

<sup>1</sup>) cf. II. <sup>2</sup>) But cf. de Vaux in Rev. Bibl. 1939, pp. 395ff. and Begrich in ZATW 1940, pp. 1ff. – see II, p. 98, n. 1.

similar circles seem to prove that a work characterized by a definite programme may come from a "circle", be the work of a "school".

Behind and before the *strata* there seem to have existed rather extensive *complexes of legends*, e.g. the legends of the immigration in Jos. 1-12 and Judg. 1. This points towards the work of *collectors of legends*. And it may perhaps lead us to a tentative *localisation* of the circles in question when we see that Jos. 1-12 has some connection with the sanctuary at *Gilgal* near *Jericho* (Jos. 1-6)<sup>1</sup>). That older legends of prophets, like those of *Elijah* and *Elisha*, are also at home at sanctuaries may be supposed on the ground that these prophets are connected with "sons of prophets" at different temples (Bethel, Jericho, Carmel, 2 Ki. 2). This makes it intelligible that later complexes (D and P) which originated in *priestly* circles incorporate *prophetic* narratives which must have belonged to different sanctuaries<sup>2</sup>). At the sanctuaries, both in priestly and prophetic circles, the traditional narrative material was preserved, and here the collections sprang up, forming the base of the larger "sources". These collections, e.g. the immigration cycle and the succession story in Sam., were perhaps already *written* before their incorporation in the "sources" which perhaps have been composed as extensive introductions to the older cycles<sup>3</sup>).

The most difficult problem is the question, how we have to imagine *the men of oral tradition* of the narrative literature?

In books dealing with these categories we often meet the expression "*schools of story tellers*". The word "schools" was used of the *written* sources J and E by *Karl Budde*<sup>4</sup>). *Gunkel* above all has contributed to the tendency to use the words "circles" and "schools" in the description of *oral* tradition<sup>5</sup>). Faithful to his method he has also tried to explain what he means by determining the "*place in life*" of the narratives on the base of hints given in the stories themselves. He refers to Ex. 12,26f.; 13,14f.; Jos. 4,6: "When children ask for information concerning a sacred custom or the meaning of a sacred symbol, then their father answers them and tells them the story. So we are justified in

<sup>1</sup>) *Alt*, in *Beih. ZATW* 66, pp. 13ff.; *Noth*, commentary on *Josua*, p. XI.

<sup>2</sup>) This is better understood when we regard the assumption of narrow relations between priests and prophets, cf. *Halдар*, *Associations of Cult Prophets* (1945) and *Johnson's* earlier work *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* (1944).

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *v. Rad's* understanding of the *Yahwist* (cf. II). This reminds us of the formation of the *synoptic gospels*, the nucleus of which is probably the passion-story to which the prior parts were added as introduction, cf. *Mosbech*, *Nytestamentlig Isagogik* (1946), p. 127f.; 172.

<sup>4</sup>) *Das Buch der Richter* (1897), p. XIV.

<sup>5</sup>) in his commentary on *Genesis*, p. VIII, cf. LXV, XXXI, cf. LXXX, LXXV.



imagining how the legend of Sodom was told in the sight of the Dead Sea and the legend of Bethel on the heights near Bethel. But the usual situation which we have to think of is this: In the winter evenings when people have nothing to do, the family is sitting round the fireplace; the grown-up and especially the children listen intently to the ancient beautiful stories of old times". But many of the legends have, *Gunkel* says, an *artistic* style so marked that they are difficult to understand as creations of the people. Therefore he supposes that Israel like the Arabs and many other nations, both past and present, had professional story tellers, "guilds of story tellers"<sup>1</sup>), who wander about the country and are met at the popular festivals.

It is easy to see that in these questions we cannot get very far outside the realm of assumption and hypotheses<sup>2</sup>). We should also point to the significance of the *cultic centres* and the *cult* itself. The passages from Exodus quoted by *Gunkel* point to the cultic situation as the place in life of some of the stories. That perhaps a great deal of them have something to do with *rituals* is an idea which of late has been gaining ground<sup>3</sup>). The story of the Exodus, the Creation stories, the story of the Flood, and perhaps other, historical, texts are possibly "myths" in the meaning of this word signifying narratives explaining the acts of the ritual. As the Passover legend shows, and according to my assumption also the story of the Ark in Sam.<sup>4</sup>), the word "myth" in this meaning in Israel does not exclude *history behind the ritual*. On the contrary, in Israel we find history as the creative factor behind the ritual, just as the historical passion of Christ has formed the festival of Christian Passover. But – as I have tried to show in the article quoted below – the stories are – as they stand now in their context – no longer directly connected with the ritual. They are "translations" of the original cult-myths into *epic* narratives and set in a framework telling the story of Israel as the story of Israel's task in the history of the world: They have become *sermons* or admonitions instead of explanations of ritual acts. The future must show us how far we can get on by means of this idea of a cultic background of the stories. But so much can be said in our present connection: The story-tellers of Israel came at least partly from the circles of the sanctuary-personnel.

<sup>1</sup>) p. XXXI, cf. LXXX.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. the sober description in *Skinner's* commentary on Genesis (1912), p. XXXI.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. p. 242.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. above all *Johs. Pedersen's* treatment of the "Passover-legend" in Ex. 1-15, Israel III-IV, pp. 297ff.; ZATW 1934, pp. 161ff. That the stories have connection with ritual can be maintained without giving up the documentary theory. Cf. my *Det sakrale kongedømme*, p. 15, and my article in JBL 1948.



On the other hand we must warn against a one-sided view. We have to face the fact, eventually, that one explanation cannot satisfy all needs. The narratives are of different kinds and contents, and we must suppose that they belong to *different* circles, priests, prophets, and layfolk. The idea of a *professional guild* of story tellers is according to analogies, also referred to by Gunkel, not improbable. Especially can the origin of stylistic peculiarities be understood in these circles, accounting for the differences of "sources" or complexes of traditions concerning both form and matter. It is also natural to suppose that it was these circles which, as time went on, undertook to *collect* the legends and when the reliability of tradition was threatened, to have them recorded in writing. So, in these professional circles, *cycles of legends* were formed, concentrated around the same persons and subjects. Legends are combined so that one or more are set in the greater framework of a *story embracing the complex*<sup>1)</sup>. We must remember that *oral tradition* did not cease when a story was fixed in writing, as the general tendency to write books accompanying so-called higher cultures took hold of the stories. Written literature begins to dominate the mode of thinking in such a manner that the revelation of God to a prophet is imagined in the abstruse form of Ez. 3,1ff. where the prophet has to eat the scroll in which his message is written (cf. Jer. 15,16). This imagery became stereotyped in Apocalyptic (Apoc. Joh. 10,9ff.).

So the oldest collections have been fixed in written form comparatively *early*, e.g. the stories of Jos. 2-12, Judg. 1, and the succession story of 2 Sam. In the latter we – as often noticed – meet a creative author of high rank. The *Yahwist* is both collector and author. More and more the *theological programmes* have taken hold of the material, and their representatives combine it with that of other circles, e.g. legends of prophets, and with laws, till the *Pentateuch* is dominated by the "schools" of P and D – the latter originally containing the whole story told in the books of the *prophetæ priores*. As an imitation and a new edition to suit later periods the *Chronistic* work is created in the later period of Persian rule.

*Litatur:* Gunkel, Genesis. Skinner, Genesis. B. Luther, Die Persönlichkeit des Jahwisten, and Die Novelle von Juda und Tamar und andere israelitische Novellen, in Ed. Meyer, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme (1906), pp. 105-206. Procksch, Das nordhebräische Sagenbuch (1906), p. 392, cf. his commentary on Genesis, 2nd ed. (1924), pp. 15ff., 290ff. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (cf. pp. 245, n. 4). Engnell, Gamla testamentet I. Eduard Nielsen, Mundtlig Tradition (Dansk Teol. Tidsskr. 1952).

<sup>1)</sup> Gunkel, Genesis, p. LII.

# FROM THE SMALLEST LITERARY UNITS TO THE GREAT LITERARY COMPLEXES

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Otto Eissfeldt has<sup>1)</sup> advanced the criticism against the programme of Gunkel for a history of OT literature, that Gunkel's programme does not do justice to the "literary units of medium size". In the case of the smallest units, he says<sup>2)</sup>, it is of great practical significance by giving us a nearly complete control against the traditional divisions of the text, the Jewish parashas and the Christian chapters<sup>3)</sup>, and therefore is of great importance for interpretation. It prevents wrong divisions of the text, e.g. the inclination of older literary criticism to separate the song of thanksgiving found at the end of some lamentations from the whole of the psalm, because it was not understood that this type, the lamentation, is inclined to thank beforehand for the salvation<sup>4)</sup>.

But the examination of the literary types does not teach us much concerning the OT books as they now stand. Here the older *literary criticism* must supply its contribution to the problems of *composition*. We get no information concerning the book of Isaiah by recognizing 63,7-65,25 as a "national liturgy of lamentation", or 5,1-7 as an "allegory", nor do we learn anything of the structure of the Book of Psalms by defining Ps. 45 as a "cultic oracle, blessing the king at his wedding, spoken by a prophet". And we know no more of the structure of Genesis by labelling some narratives "ætiological legends".

In some books this labelling of the smallest units of course is the most important task, because they mainly consist of "smallest units", linked loosely together, e.g. Cant., Lamentations, the Psalms, and partly Proverbs. But Eissfeldt points out that the *parallel passages* in the Psalms and Proverbs nevertheless point to a problem which is not solved through "Gattungsforschung"

<sup>1)</sup> cf. above, pp. 15ff.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 138.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. pp. 48ff.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. p. 158.

alone. It is however mainly in the prophetic<sup>1)</sup> and historical books that the "Gattungsforschung" fails to solve the problems of their literary history. *Eissfeldt* underlines that even if the former exhibit no consistent chronological and material arrangement, nevertheless there are certain principles at the base of the arrangement. Sometimes we can perceive a *plan* which seems to have been destroyed. *Eissfeldt* points to *Is. 6* which certainly must have been placed at the beginning of a book, and to Amos 7-9 where the visions originally must have formed a coherent whole, now destroyed by the insertion of other prophetic words and the story of the controversy between Amos and the priest at Bethel. Similar examples are collected from the laws. Deut. 16,21-17,7 splits 16,18-20 + 17, 8-13 in two and would be in a better position after 12,31. We might also point to the disordered state of 2 Sam. 5-24, or - again with *Eissfeldt* - still more appropriately to the story of the Flood, Gen. 6-9, or to the story of the crossing of the Jordan and the conquest of Jericho, both swarming with incongruities of every kind and probably not to be understood unless we assume that several narratives have been combined, so that a separation and a reconstruction are imperative claims.

The following paragraphs will be of a rather short and sketchy character. Much has already been said in previous chapters concerning the history of the categories and their grouping together into greater units. We shall tentatively attempt to determine the *categories of the greater units*. But we must underline the *tentative* character of the undertaking. It is only a start, perhaps proving to be a false one. But someone has to start. Perhaps the mistakes then will call for criticism capable of leading to better results, so that the false start has not been quite useless.

## THE POETICAL BOOKS

Above pp. 144ff. we have seen that *lyric poems* have been collected in greater or smaller *anthologies* now lost, but mentioned in literature quoting them. But some are still preserved in the form of Biblical "books": The Song of Songs, Lamentations, and the Psalms.

Concerning *Lamentations* we cannot say anything of the prehistory of this book. It only contains 5 poems, placed in succession after one another, but they might as well be placed according to other mathematical possibilities.

<sup>1)</sup> The difficulty of determining the limits of the "smallest units" has not been completely overcome, cf. *Mowinkel's* discussion of my commentary on *Is. 11* in *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* (1946), cf. *Prophecy and Tradition*, p. 59f.



We have here no real problem of composition leading us to ask the question of a more original form.

Coming to the *Song of Songs* we meet some *repetitions* of the same poem or parts of the same poem<sup>1)</sup>. This raises the question, Have not some earlier collections been added to one another in the present book? But we cannot answer the question in a decisive way, for the repetitions may of course be due to scribal whims or other more sensible factors. The theories which try to understand the book as a drama will be reviewed in the Special Introduction.

The *Book of Psalms* in different ways reveals its past. The *repetition* of some psalms and fragments of psalms points to the addition of several minor collections as the probable solution, and other instances hint at the existence of such earlier collections: The Pilgrim Songs 120-134; the Korah- and Asaph Psalms, now dispersed throughout the middle of the book (42-49; 84-85; 87-88; and 50; 73-83); the subscription 72,20 pointing to an *anthology* called "the Prayers of David the Son of Jesse". Finally, the partition into 5 parts also reveals the hand of a compiler.

It would be important if it were possible to give a determination of the books as regards their *literary category*. This can hardly be done in the cases of the *Song of Songs* and the *Lamentations*. Titles like "*Song Book*" or "*Anthology*" cannot easily be exalted to the class of termini technici of the "*Gattungsforschung*". That would mean that we had to single out certain stylistic or other features characteristic of the collections as entities. But in the case of the *Psalms* something of this kind might be done. The introductory poem (Ps. 1) seems to be a sort of *motto*, taken from the *Wisdom schools*. Accordingly, the book might be regarded as a *Wisdom book*. That would mean that it has been transferred to another "place in life" than most of its single small units. We shall see that it may be looked upon as a sort of book to be read for edification<sup>2)</sup>. The Sages have taken it over from the cultic life. From the temple it has been transferred to the school.

## WISDOM LITERATURE

The Book of *Proverbs* is evidently composed of a series of independent collections<sup>3)</sup> placed freely in succession one after another. Their *relative dates* may be determined comparatively easily.<sup>4)</sup> Greater difficulty is found in

<sup>1)</sup> cf. II.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. II.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. II.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. II.

the works where the *sentential* form develops into or is replaced by the form of *treatise* or *essay*. We may also refer to the form of dialogue in Job. The examination of categories here leads to a most valuable understanding of a great many details, and the literary analysis can now and then contribute to a reconstruction of the original form of the works. That the original order of the sections has suffered damage in some parts of *Job* will be noted in the Special Introduction<sup>1)</sup>. But it will also be seen that the distinction between "genuine" and "not genuine" material here as in *Ecclesiastes* has often been driven to extremes calling for reaction.

But more important, here too, it is to attempt a determination of the *literary categories* to which the books may be referred as collective units.

The *collections of proverbs* cannot easily be called by other names, people might say. But seeing that such collections are perhaps the most genuine expression of the literature of the schools we may get deeper into the matter by saying that even these collections are characteristic examples of what must be called the "*Wisdom Book*". In the special Introduction<sup>2)</sup> we shall note that the Greek form of the *Diatribē* appears in one late work of this kind. And between that book and the oldest collections of proverbs in sentential form we have a series of other works showing the dissolution of the sentential form. We have younger sections (Prov. 1ff.) where "sentences" are continued beyond the limits of the single line, growing into small "treatises"<sup>3)</sup>, mostly *admonitions*. This also appears in *Ecclesiastes* which through the constant reference to experience<sup>4)</sup> nearly acquires the character of a *spiritual autobiography* or "*confessiones*". The same mixture of different elements is found in the work of *Sirach* and the *Wisdom of Solomon*, the latter even containing *edificatory historiography* (ch. 10ff.). By all this we do not mean to say that the form of the *diatribē* has developed from the collection of proverbs. The form of the *diatribē* probably comes from other sources<sup>5)</sup>, the instruction of *Greek philosophers*. A special place is occupied by the book of Job<sup>6)</sup>. To the form of the dialogue we have analogies outside Israel, Egyptian books like "The eloquent Peasant"<sup>7)</sup>, "The Strife between a man weary of life and his soul"<sup>8)</sup>, and the concluding

<sup>1)</sup> II.

<sup>2)</sup> II.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. p. 175.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. p. 175f.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. *Bultmann* in *RGG*, 2nd ed. I, col. 1255.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. above, pp. 181ff.

<sup>7)</sup> Engl. transl. in *Barton*, *Archaeology and the Bible*, p. 525, cf. *Erman*, *Literatur der Ägypter*, pp. 157ff.

<sup>8)</sup> German translation, *Erman*, pp. 122 ff.

section of the "Wisdom of Anii"<sup>1)</sup>; further a Babylonian text, the "Dialogue between a servant and his master"<sup>2)</sup>. In the case of the framework of Job, the narrative must be regarded as an element making the book assume the character of a "story", perhaps to be styled "The Legend of Job", of edificatory type. As shown above p. 182 the *dialogue* has the form of a "dramatized psalm of lamentation".

## PROPHECY AND APOCALYPTIC

Most books of the Prophets (the *prophetae posteriores*) now are rather complicated quantities which must make a somewhat bewildering impression on the reader without the necessary historical knowledge. The understanding of their *composition* generally cannot be attained through the examination of their smallest units. In several instances the Special Introduction<sup>3)</sup> will tend to give up the problem as insoluble. Eissfeldt<sup>4)</sup> points to the fact the *Dodecapheton* is composed of different books, by tradition separated by means of superscriptions, except Zech. 9-14. But we cannot say that we are so fortunate in the case of other books.

Certainly, here and there we also have in other books *superscriptions* marking parts of them as independent collections, e.g. Jer. 23,9, introducing the section ending at 32 or 40 incl. But also Jer. 30,1-4 contains a similar superscription, cf. 46,1; 25,13b. In like manner we have to regard superscriptions as those in Is. and Zech. 9-14, and the *dates*, e.g. in Ez. or Zech. 1-8 or Haggai. A piece of information like that given in Jer. 36 on the fate of the original scroll of the book of Jeremiah must lead to the assumption of a complex hidden in the present book, which, when discovered and separated from other material, would render a comparatively authentic collection of words of Jeremiah. But the assumption so far only has led scholars into intellectual pains of Tantalus.<sup>5)</sup>

Criteria based on the *contents* of the books may lead to the discovery of originally independent collections. Eissfeldt here also takes his examples from the book of Isaiah (24-27; 34-35; 40-55; 56-66). We might also refer to the formal and material connection between the "woes" in 5,8ff. and 10,1ff., and between 9,7-20 and 5,25-30<sup>6)</sup>. The separation of originally independent units

<sup>1)</sup> Erman, p. 301f.

<sup>2)</sup> AOT, pp. 284ff.

<sup>3)</sup> II.

<sup>4)</sup> p. 159.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. II.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. my commentary.



of medium size is further served even by the recognition of different *types* of literature. The books of the prophets are mainly composed of *three elements* – a) collections of single “words” (oracles etc.) being either *words of Yahweh* speaking in the first person, or *words of the prophet* mentioning Yahweh in the third person, or a mixture of both; b) “autobiographical records” of the work of the prophet, especially concerning his experience of vocation; c) *narratives* concerning the prophet, coming from his disciples (“prophetic devotional legends”).

These elements may be mixed in different ways. We have sections mostly consisting of *type c*, narratives of events in the life of the prophet. But in these are inserted *words* of his (*type a*), sometimes in greater quantity. This form is very frequent in the “legends of the prophets” in Sam.–Kings (cf. 1 Sam. 15; 2 Sam. 12; 1 Ki. 14 and 21; 2 Ki. 9). Similar phenomena we meet in the Balaam-stories and 1 Ki. 22, containing relations of visions (*type b*). Among the prophetiae posteriores we may mention Is. 7 as a prophet-legend with inserted oracles, cf. Jer. 21,1–6; 21,1ff.; 26; 32; 36; 37; 42; 43; Hos. 1. But generally *type c* is not too frequent in the prophetiae posteriores (Amos 7,10–17; Hos. 3; Haggai; Is. 20 and 26–37). *Type b* and above all *type a* are predominant. A mixture of this kind is of course hardly original. It is generally supposed that the collections at the outset were composed of elements of the same type.

Recently Engnell has proposed a classification of the prophetic books which seems very useful. The orally transmitted material could be arranged in two ways. He labels the first form of book “the *“diwan-type”*”, combining the oracles according to catchword principles etc. This reveals most clearly the work of oral tradition. The other type is the “*liturgy-type*”, imitating rituals and perhaps put down in written form from the beginning. To the first class he reckons Amos, Hosea, Isaiah 1–39. In the second he puts Nahum, Habakkuk, Joel, and Deutero-Isaiah<sup>1</sup>).

*Apocalyptic* presents something of a change. Like the literature of the Psalms, so prophecy has fallen into the hands of the *sages*. The apocalyptists are not ecstatic prophets, but *learned men of letters*. Therefore *type a* (oracles etc.) nearly disappears, while *c* and *b*, the legends and the description of visions, become predominant. When these elements are mixed, as in Dan., it leads to the assumption of originally independent corpora. But again we must warn against dogmatism, for there is a strong unity in the book of Daniel, not

<sup>1</sup>) cf. further my papers, Oudtest. Studiën VIII (1950), p. 97, and Hervormde Theologiese Studies 1951, pp. 106–109; *Eissfeldt* in The OT and Modern Study, p. 131, and above, p. 144 n. 2.

only externally (the dates), but also in thought (ch. 2, cf. ch. 7; the vision in 8 interprets part of 7 etc.). In *Enoch* it is possible to separate original complexes by means of the *superscriptions*<sup>1)</sup>.

The apocalyptists belong to the circles of the wise men. But nevertheless we must not exaggerate the conception of them as "learned men of letters". *Ludin Jansen*<sup>2)</sup> has collected a vast quantity of material illuminating their dependence on *Hellenistic Wisdom teachers*, wandering all over the world, and their material of knowledge. But this must not be misunderstood. They are more than dry as dust teachers. "Their faith, says *Bousset*"<sup>3)</sup>, threatens to become mathematics, their hope an arithmetical problem. But in it there is nevertheless much honest yearning. They have wept and prayed, fasted and fought for a revelation. We must not imagine these apocalyptists only as authors in whom everything which they tell of revelations, dreams, visions and raptures, transportations to heaven and dialogues with God or his heavenly messengers, is only forms. It is often difficult to determine the boundary. As surely as the author of the animal-visions of *Enoch* was a rather bad author, just as surely real experiences lie behind the visions of *4 Ezra*, written by a bleeding heart, and behind many other products of Jewish apocalyptic. In overwhelming pain at the history of their people, darkening more and more, passionately intoxicated by a hope again and again disappointed, but over again strengthened, these apocalyptists have also had dreams and visions, seen angelic figures, and heard angelic voices, and conversed with heavenly beings; they have in raptures – whether in the body, or out of the body, they could not tell – pressed forward into Paradise, into the uppermost heaven where heavenly mysteries were opened to them. Then, in the belief that now they have found the solution of the riddle they have communicated their revelations to their contemporaries".

An especially characteristic element contributing to the understanding of the books of the *prophetae posteriores* is a certain *pattern of composition* perceivable in many places. There has been an inclination to arrange the sections in *alternating groups of prophecies of woe followed by prophecies of weal*. This pattern is generally supposed to originate not from the prophets themselves, but from their disciples<sup>4)</sup>. Especially have *post-exilic times*, based on their experiences,

<sup>1)</sup> cf. II.

<sup>2)</sup> in his dissertation *Die Henochgestalt* (1940).

<sup>3)</sup> *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (ed. by *Gressmann* 1925), p. 212.

<sup>4)</sup> *Engnell*, in several places, expresses the opinion that the pattern was used by the prophets themselves. This is not impossible, but I think we must wait for a more thoroughgoing proof than hitherto given. His last treatment known to me stands in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1947. cf. *The Call of Isaiah* (1949), pp. 54–60. See below, p. 260, n. 1.



been inclined to give the prophetic words a “happy ending”, a tendency also appearing in the practice of the synagogue to repeat the last verse but one of Malachi after the last one in order not to conclude by a threatening word; in like manner the end of the Book of Isaiah was treated. This was done bona fide, the Jewish congregation having experienced the return from exile as the end of punishment, and as firstfruits of the advent of the kingdom of God.

This pattern of composition is supposed to represent *foreign influence*. It has been pointed out that some *Egyptian* texts of “prophetic” appearance from about 2000 B.C. contain the same scheme<sup>1)</sup>. *Eissfeldt* thinks, perhaps rightly, that these texts have not influenced the Biblical prophets directly, but more probably the disciples collecting and composing the books, and he even underlines that the influence is no more than a possibility. The pattern is of too common a human character – who does not know that feeling in our times? – that after looking forward to an expected difficulty and having felt your teeth beating the devil’s tattoo for fear, you nevertheless console yourself with the assurance or at least the hope that there will come better times afterwards!

More probable is the assumption of foreign literary influence in another place. In an *Egyptian* document from the middle of the 3rd century, the so-called “*Demotic Chronicle*”<sup>2)</sup>, we encounter a form quite similar to the *apocalyptic historiography* known especially from Dan. 7–12, where the author under the guise of prophecy describes events of the past (*vaticinia ex eventu*) and uses them as a basis for prediction of coming events. Similar phenomena occur in nearly all apocalypses, generally combined with some form of the *theory of world periods*<sup>3)</sup>. But again it is not certain that we have to regard this foreign influence as purely Egyptian. *Eissfeldt* in this connection mentions that similar features are found in literature under *Iranian* influence, e.g. in the *Sibyllines* and the so-called *Oracles of Hystaspes*.

An important characteristic in apocalyptic is its *pseudonymity*. This feature has been excellently explained by *Mowinckel*<sup>4)</sup>: “In the circles behind the *Book of Enoch* the sage Enoch who “walked with God” and was taken away into heaven has been considered source and author of ancient revelations and also “*patron saint*” of contemporary sages and apocalyptic preachers . . . The contents of the revelations which the circles [behind the book] derived from *Enoch* comprised in the main knowledge of the double meaning of the events of

1) *Neferehu's Prophecies*, The Admonitions of *Ipuwer*, cf. *Erman*, Lit. d. Ägypter, pp. 151ff.; AOT, pp. 46–55; *Barton*, Archaeology and the Bible, pp. 521ff.

2) ed. by *Spiegelberg*, Die sogenannte demotische Chronik (1914).

3) cf. II.

4) *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* (1940), p. 212.



primeval ages, of the structure of the universe and the course of the celestial bodies enabling the wise to calculate ages and world periods and so predict the end of the world . . . Patron saint of all later sages *Enoch* could be, because he lived in heaven as a sort of mediator between God and men. Just as *Noah* once visited him "at the end of the earth" and received mysteries revealed by him, so also the sages of the present age through prayer and fasting and study of the old books, and perhaps also by means of ecstatic exercises are able to get revelations from him to complete and give authentic interpretations of the ancient traditions." In this work of the sages is used much "Chaldæan" wisdom.

If we try to determine the *literary type* of the complete books in the *prophetæ posteriores* we might start from the *formal peculiarities* just mentioned which are especially characteristic of Apocalyptic, and especially from the scheme: time of woe . . . time of weal; from the distinction between "the present age" and the contrast in "the age to come". It looks as if people more and more have imagined the prophets in the image of the apocalyptists. We must remember that the apocalyptists describe themselves as ecstatic prophets interpreting the old words through new inspiration. The type of literature must be called "*Apocalypse*", book of revelation of coming things (Apoc. 1,1). It may take many forms, but the book of *Ezekiel* in several respects seems to have set the pattern.

*Literature:* Budde, Eine folgenschwere Redaktion des Zwölfprophetenbuches (ZATW 1921, pp. 218ff.). Ed. Meyer, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme (1906), pp. 451-55. Dürr, Die Stellung des Propheten Ezechiel in der isr.-jüd. Apokalyptik (1923); Ursprung und Ausbau der isr.-jüd. Heilandserwartung (1925), pp. 1-15. Gressmann, Der Messias (1929), pp. 417-445. Windisch, Die Orakel des Hystaspes (1929). Ludin Jansen, Die Henochgestalt (1940), cf. Mowinkel (above p. 259, n. 4). Mosbech, Fortolkningen af Johannes Aabenbaring i Fortid og Nutid (1934), cf. Talt og Skrevet (1940), pp. 45ff. H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic (1947). - Steinmann, Daniel (1950), pp. 32ff.

## THE LAWS

Following *Hylmö* we have traced<sup>1)</sup> the development of the single units of the laws viâ minor collections ("balks") into law books. The shapelessness of the final forms, their repetitions, contradictions, breaks of style etc. show that none of them has come down to us in original form. Something of this can be explained as *correcting revision*. Eissfeldt e.g. refers to Lev. 23 where the original P<sup>h</sup> (Code of Holiness) has been adapted and corrected by insertions from P<sup>g</sup> (the main stratum of the Priestly Code), and where, in vs. 18-19, it can be proved that the source of the adaptation is Num. 28,27-30. In other cases, we are able to

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 221.

solve the problems only by means of some sort of "documentary hypothesis"<sup>1)</sup>. But the separation of sources in the laws is much more difficult than in the narrative parts of the Law. In the latter it is often possible to *control* the soundness of the theory by the fact that the separate parts can be combined to yield intelligible coherent strata. This control fails in the case of the legal material, because the analysis cannot result in the discovery of new works with a coherence capable of objective proof. One example, from Deut., makes an exception<sup>2)</sup>.

We are able to separate certain strata in the Book of the Covenant, some scholars using the distinction between *mišpātīm* and *dēbārīm* as criterion. It may be supposed that Deut. 21–25 beside the cultic laws in 12–20 are an original collection of older, casuistical civil laws. In like manner we can distinguish strata and originally independent sections in P by means of super- and subscriptions et sim.<sup>3)</sup>

But there are also other means to determine special units. The conclusion of the *Code of Holiness* (Lev. 26) shows that here is the *ending of a law book*. Similar features are found in the conclusion of the *Deuteronomic law* (Deut. 28ff.). And in this code the *introductory speeches* also prove the existence of a characteristic *beginning* of such codes. The analytic problems of these introductions and conclusions will not be dealt with here. They belong to the Special Introduction. But so much seems clear that Deuteronomy is proof of the fact that a book of very clear composition is imbedded in the present book which partakes of the common shapelessness of the Pentateuch. The original Deuteronomic law has begun with admonitions to keep the law, and it ended in a great speech in which the congregation is confronted with the necessity of choice between blessing and curse. That this feature was not peculiar to the Deuteronomistic school is proved by the corresponding parts of the Code of Holiness and the conclusion of the Code of Hammurapi.

The introductory and concluding admonitions of the laws have above p. 206f. been derived from *parenetic parts of psalms* connected with a renewal of the covenant between God and his people. This leads us to ask the question if this has not anything to tell us of the *place in life* of the code. It has been read as part of a *liturgy*. This is confirmed not only by some paragraphs in the code itself (ch. 30, 9–13, 24–27), but also by the description of the promulgation of Deuteronomy in 2 Ki. 23. And this further suggests a place in life of the same kind for other codes too.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. II, and above pp. 225ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 253.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. p. 219.

If *Noth* in broad outline is right in this theory advanced in his *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* I the Deuteronomic law has been placed at the beginning of the Deuteronomic work of history. This might account for the disorder and the doublets in the introductory and the concluding speeches, at least to some extent. And it would illustrate a process also at work in other places: That *laws are now parts of a historical narrative*. And this changes the *type of laws*.

The present Law has the character of a *Book of History*. But this seems to be a feature of older works. Already the Yahwist and the Elohist have had their corpus of law in connection with the Sinai-Horeb story. This is a consequence of the historical character of the religion of Israel.

*Literature:* Waterman, Pre-Israelite Laws in the Book of the Covenant (Am. Journ. of Sem. Lang. and Lit. 1921-22, pp. 36ff.). Jepsen, Untersuchungen zum Bundesbuch (1927). J. M. Powis Smith, The Origin and History of Hebrew Law (1931).

## BOOKS OF HISTORY

That the Books of History are no original unities but compilations is proved, if not by other instances then at least by the direct references to "*sources*" in *Chronicles* and *Kings*.<sup>1)</sup> Similarly the *Hexateuch* (Num. 21 and Jos. 10) and the Books of *Sam.* and *Kings* (2 Sam. 1 and 1 Ki. 8) quote old collections of poetry. It is also obvious that the *Chronistic* work of history has taken over two originally independent sources, the memoirs of *Nehemiah* and the *Ezra-Legend*. Further, in the *Chronistic* work as well as in the Deuteronomic we can pick out many *documents*, letters, lists, genealogies.<sup>2)</sup>

A combination of an examination of literary categories and of contents of the books will allow us to single out different *types of narratives* and again combine them as belonging to different *circles*, e.g. in the Books of *Kings*: the *prophetic* legends as different from the *annalistic* material. Finally the *legal* material can be separated from the story of the *Hexateuch* as independent corpora with a history of composition of their own.

To all this then come the *documentary or other hypotheses*, attempting to explain the shapelessness of the historical books<sup>3)</sup>. We shall see that the "*sources*" of the *Hexateuch* have been told with a very clear "*scopus*": They point towards the culmination in the narratives of the immigration in Jos. 1-12 and Judg. 1.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. Skjot-Pedersen, Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift (1940), pp. 25ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. pp. 209ff.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. II.



In the same manner "sources" of Judg.-Sam. have their "scopus" in the history of *David* and the building of the temple under Solomon. These "sources" – however we are to imagine their structure and origin – are composed as introductions to units of "medium size" already fixed in written form.

Within the strata, accordingly, it seems imperative to separate units which already existed before the time of J and E in written form. Certainly this is the case with Jos. 1-12 (i.e. the older, non-Deuteronomistic material, as shown by *Noth* in his commentary), and probably also in the case of the succession story, the scopus of Judg.-Sam. The theories of *Noth* and *Rudolph*<sup>1)</sup> concerning Jos. 1-12 and Judg. 1 are very interesting in this connection. In the same manner *von Rad* shows how the collecting activity of the *Yahvist* is changed into that of *creative authorship* through the manner in which he places the Sinai story, the Patriarchal traditions, and the Primeval Story in his vast system. Much of this material may have existed as written material, for we have to take into account that the recording has begun with greater or smaller cycles of legends already formed by oral tradition.<sup>2)</sup>

When we come to deal with the *analysis of sources* in the individual books in the Special Introduction we shall have to issue a warning against the inclination to pursue the old sources *J* and *E* all through Judg., Sam. and Kings, even if we cannot evade the assumption that a sort of documentary hypothesis is the proper solution of many problems of these books, especially in Sam. But on the other hand we also shall have to refer to the *coherence between the books*, not only between the Pentateuch and Joshua, but between Joshua and Judges, Judges and Samuel, and Samuel and Kings. This coherence arouses suspicion that the old "sources" have been continued, maybe by other "authors", already before the composition of the Deuteronomic work of history. This seems to indicate that the Deuteronomists have not been the first to create a "*History of Israel*", but that the pre-Deuteronomistic material in Gen.-Kings has already been part of a history of this kind.

Here to start upon a reconstruction of this history, as *Eissfeldt* does<sup>3)</sup>, we do not think appropriate. It contains too many uncertain elements side by side with many interesting points of view. But nevertheless we can discern a *history of historiography* in Israel through the different strands of Gen.-Kings: We perceive how the progressing theological development constantly brings in new points of view, until the times have changed so definitely that there is

<sup>1)</sup> cf. II.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 248f.

<sup>3)</sup> pp. 143-154.

need of a quite new work. Then the *Chronicle's* work is created in order to replace Gen.-Kings<sup>1</sup>).

It only remains to offer some remarks concerning the task of literary history, to determine the categories of historical books. Such determination has been undertaken by tradition calling the *Five Books of Moses* the *Law*. But it is clear that this isolation of the Pentateuch is – not an arbitrary, for as we shall see<sup>2</sup>) it has its theological base – but nevertheless a forcible encroachment upon the coherence created by the successive redactions and perhaps already by the oldest “sources”. I assume that it is P that in this respect set the example, for P has, as we shall see, left no definite traces outside the Pentateuch. It seems to have abandoned the scopus of the older sources, the immigration tradition. The *Deuteronomistic* work of history has had its definite *admonishing* tendency to exhibit the continuous apostasy of Israel till the catastrophe came in 587 as punishment for its unwillingness to “amend its ways and its doings”. It therefore gets a character of definite *devotional tendency*. It is admonition in the form of historical narrative and an expression of the interesting fact that it is the type of “*devotional legend*” which now dominates historiography.

But it would be unjust not to underline that this devotional tendency is present also in the work of the *Yahwist*. His work is the tale of the election of Abraham and underlines the thought that Israel has a great task in the history of the world, to convey benediction to the nations instead of the curse brought upon men through the Fall of the first parents in the garden of God. This *tendency of admonition*, to keep Israel up to its holy task, is carried on in all historiography in Israel and in Judaism. It also flourishes in the inclination of later Judaism to use the historical short story and novel for devotional purposes (Jonah, Ruth, Esther, Tobit, Judith etc.). This also influences *Wisdom* literature, e.g. in the description of the *History of Wisdom* in Wisd. 10ff. and elsewhere. In good old style 1 Macc. like the succession story is capable of edifying work without using a pointer; but the devotional tendency is also present even this work of Maccabean propaganda.

*Literature:* Eissfeldt, § 17. Hennecke, Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen (1924), pp. 163–171.

<sup>1</sup>) I refer to my sketch *Det israelitiske historiesyn* in *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* (1944), cf. also C. North, *The Old Testament Interpretation of History* (1946).

<sup>2</sup>) cf. II.

## CONTENTS

Preface .....	5
Abbreviations.....	7
Introduction to the Old Testament, History, Task and Method.....	9
THE CANON.....	20
<i>The Canon of Palestine</i> .....	20
Canon and Apocrypha.....	20
Prehistory of the Canon.....	21
The traditional opinion concerning the origin of the Canon.....	26
The finishing of the Jewish Canon.....	27
The order of the books.....	31
The idea of the Canon among the Palestinian Jews.....	33
The Canon of the Samaritans.....	34
<i>The Canon of Alexandria</i> .....	35
<i>The Canon in the Church</i> .....	38
THE TEXT.....	42
<i>Introductory remarks</i> .....	42
<i>The outward form of the Text</i> .....	42
The writing materials.....	42
The signs of the alphabet.....	45
Divisions of the text.....	48
<i>The Massoretic Text</i> .....	50
The traditional view.....	50
The Massorettes.....	52
The work of the Massorettes.....	56
Hebrew witnesses of the text.....	58
Printed editions.....	58
Manuscripts.....	60
Vocalisation and accentuation.....	62
<i>Other Witnesses of the Text</i> .....	65
Traditions of the text in closely related Semitic Languages.....	66
The Samaritan Pentateuch.....	66
The Targumim.....	68



Arabic translations.....	72
The Syriac translation.....	72
The Greek translations.....	74
The Septuagint.....	75
The current view.....	75
Kahle's theory.....	80
Manuscripts.....	85
Translations derived from the "LXX".....	86
The Vetus Latina.....	86
The Coptic translations.....	88
The Ethiopic translation.....	88
Other translations based upon Greek texts.....	89
Independent Greek translations.....	89
Aquila.....	89
Theodotion.....	90
Symmachus.....	91
Quinta, Sexta, Septima.....	92
The Vulgate.....	92
Helps to textual criticism inside the different witnesses.....	93
<i>The original Text and its Fate</i> .....	94
Textual criticism.....	95
Common changes in the text.....	98
Conclusion.....	101
THE FORMS OF LITERATURE.....	102
Oral tradition and "Literature".....	102
History of old Testament literature: its General Character.....	108
Native and foreign material in Old Testament Literature.....	113
POETRY.....	118
<i>The forms of Hebrew poetry</i> .....	119
<i>Profane and religious poetry</i> .....	122
Workers' songs.....	124
Mocking songs, drinking songs, watchman's song.....	126
Wedding poetry.....	128
Funeral songs.....	128
War poetry.....	138
Patriarchal words.....	141
Historical localisation and collections of songs.....	144
The Psalms.....	146
The Hymn.....	149
The Psalms of Thanksgiving.....	153
The Psalms of Lamentation.....	154
"Foreign types." Liturgies. Mixture of types.....	159
The types of the psalms outside their place in life.....	163
Cultic poetry or non-cultic lyrics?.....	165
Poets and collections of poems.....	166

The Wisdom Literature.....	167
Popular Proverbs.....	167
The "Sentence" and its place in life.....	169
Other types of Wisdom Literature.....	177
The riddle.....	177
Parables.....	179
Fables.....	179
Prose forms. The diatribe.....	181
Types from other spheres of culture.....	181
Oracles.....	183
The Priestly Oracle.....	185
Technique.....	185
The Form of the Oracle.....	186
Benediction and Curse.....	187
Liturgical <i>tōrah</i> .....	188
Ordeal.....	190
Sermons.....	190
The prophetic oracle.....	191
Prophets and Prophecy.....	191
The Style of the Prophetic Oracle.....	194
Other Prophetic types.....	198
Speeches of reproach.....	198
The Admonition.....	200
Prophetic <i>tōrah</i> .....	201
PROSE.....	203
Introductory.....	203
Speeches.....	203
Political speeches.....	206
Sermons.....	207
Documents.....	209
Letters.....	212
Epistles.....	213
Laws.....	213
Foreign influence.....	216
Smallest units.....	219
The style of the legal rules.....	224
The confusion of styles.....	226
Original collections of uniform character.....	226
State laws or sacral laws?.....	228
Narratives.....	232
Ætiological legends.....	235
Devotional legends.....	237
Fairy tales.....	240
Myths.....	241
History—narrative and historiography.....	243
Historiography, historiographers, and narrators.....	248

FROM THE SMALLEST LITERARY UNITS TO THE GREAT LITERARY COMPLEXES.....	252
<i>Introductory remarks.....</i>	252
<i>The poetical books.....</i>	253
<i>Wisdom literature.....</i>	254
<i>Prophecy and Apocalyptic.....</i>	256
<i>The Laws.....</i>	260
<i>Books of history.....</i>	262



INTRODUCTION  
TO  
THE OLD TESTAMENT

INTRODUCTION  
TO  
THE OLD TESTAMENT

BY  
AAGE BENTZEN  
*Hon. Dr. Theol., Basel University*  
*Late Professor in*  
*the University of Copenhagen*

VOL. II  
THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

SEVENTH EDITION

G. E. C. GAD PUBLISHER . COPENHAGEN 1967

## PREFACE

*It is not customary to write a preface to the second volume of a book. But the present work seems to need some explanations, which at least will satisfy a need felt by myself.*

*The treatment of the "Special Introduction" has been the main theme of Introductions in previous literature on the subject. What I have had to say, has been said to stress the importance of form-critical and — in connection with this — the cultic implications in the history of literature. The present volume accordingly is not so detailed as the first volume. It has great recent, valuable predecessors not to be superseded by my book, e. g. the works of Eissfeldt and Pfeiffer, which treat its material in much greater detail and with more final results. Final results have not been my interest here. I have, when I wrote my paragraphs on the books of the Old Testament, had in mind the description of the methods of interpretation, given in lectures by one of my deceased teachers, professor, dr. theol. Christian Glarbo. We have first to form a provisional opinion of the text. But this first impression will be corrected through more penetrating study. My paragraphs intend to furnish a start for the study, not to give the final results or the more detailed examination. I am — in this way — writing "Introduction" in a very proper sense, I think. And in connection with this very preliminary work I have had two aims. First to orientate readers in the discussion of my own time and — especially — my own surroundings. Therefore my quotations are chiefly concerned with Scandinavian literature, e. g. the important "new Swedish school". In this undertaking I am also making a virtue of necessity. For it is still very difficult to get especially American literature here. Works which I have ordered one and two years ago I have not been able to lay hands on yet. A Bibliography could therefore not be compiled. And, secondly, I am trying to connect this volume with the first one, in order to note the places — tentatively, as is necessary in such matters not yet fully understood — where form-critical and cultic points of view have to be experimented with.*

*As in the preface to the first volume I also here feel myself urged to express my thanks to Professor Rowley of Manchester for reading the manuscript and improving my style, and also for valuable suggestions concerning matters of contents, and for his ever ready willingness to place at my disposal books which I could not get in Denmark.*



*Stud. theol. Evald Jørgensen has arranged the indexes. I thank him for relieving me of this work.*

*I have added a list of corrections and additions to vol. I which I ask readers to note. I thank those colleagues, above all professor Driver of Magdalen College, Oxford, who have called my attention to misprints and defects in the mentioning of literature.*

*Hellerup, Denmark, in February 1949.*

*Aage Bentzen.*

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

*In this place I want once more to repeat what I have said in the above preface to the first edition of vol. II. My paragraphs intend to furnish a start for the study, not to give final results or the more detailed examination. I want to place readers in the midst of the discussion of our own time, and – especially – in my own surroundings. And I am trying to connect the two volumes with one another. When some colleagues have found my discussions of the books unsatisfactory this is – e.g. in the case of the Book of Isaiah – explained by the limitations of aims which I, according to what has just been said, have imposed upon myself. But it is also accounted for by another circumstance. I admit that I very often find that Introductions say more than I think can be said on the different subjects. When I read investigations of the composition of the prophetic books I often must tell myself that I do not think we can say so much yet. I therefore with some resignation voluntarily restrain myself to the task of attempting a quite preliminary introduction to the problems of the book in question.*

*April 1952.*

*Aage Bentzen.*

## CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO VOL. I.

- P. 25, line 20:* 3th, read 5th.  
*P. 29, line 13:* cf. Hagiga 13.  
*P. 30, line 21:* add: Tosefta Sanhedrin XII.  
*PP. 42 ff.:* Consult now the important books of *Diringer*, *The Alphabet* (1948), and *Driver*, *Semitic Writing* (1948).  
*P. 45, line 15:* Insert an "is" before the last word of the line.  
*P. 58, line 3—4:* *Aptowitzer's* work was continued in three fascicles in the *Wiener Sitzungsberichte*, from 1908 and 1910-1911.  
*P. 61, line 21:* add: *Yadaim IV*, 5 proves the existence of Hebrew manuscripts in the old Semitic script from the time of the Mishnah. We may discover them some day. The MSS from Palestine, found 1947!  
*P. 82, line 18:* No part.... read: No other part....  
*P. 106, n. 2:* add a reference to *Driver*, *Semitic Writing*.  
*P. 129, n. 3:* read *Johannsen*.  
*P. 144, n. 2:* read: *Engnell*.  
*P. 220, line 10:* read: Lev. 7, 37 (38).

Other additions will be found in different places in vol. II.

# THE CANONICAL BOOKS

## THE LAW

### PARTS AND CONTENTS

The first and most important part of Holy Scripture bears the name *The Law*, *sefer hattōrah*, – in spite of the fact that large parts are not “law”, technically speaking, but narrative<sup>1</sup>).

Of old it is divided into *five books*, whence the name *The Pentateuch*. Modern theological literature uses the term “*the Hexateuch*” to express the notion that the Book of Joshua is an organic continuation of the Pentateuch. But most recently Engnell<sup>2</sup>) has introduced the word “*the Tetrateuch*” to mark his separation of the first four books from the beginning of the Deuteronomic work of history in Deut.

The division into five books cannot be dated with certainty. It is generally assumed to be the model of the partition of the Book of Psalms, and accordingly seems to be comparatively old.

The five books have *Hebrew names* taken from the opening words of the books: 1) *bēre'sīt*, 2) *wē'elleh šēmōt*, 3) *wajjikrā*, 4) *wajjedabber* or *bammidbār*, 5) *'elleh haddēbārīm*. Greek tradition (LXX) has left its mark upon the common *Latin names*, alluding to the contents of the books: 1) *Genesis* (the Origins), 2) *Exodus* (i.e. from Egypt), 3) *Leviticus* (the Levitical book), 4) *Numeri* (Numbers, i.e. the census). The Greek-Latin name of the fifth book, *Deuteronomium* (Deuteronomy), originates in a misunderstanding of the Greek rendering of *'eth-mišneh hattōrah hazzō't* in Dt. 17,18: *lō deuteronomion toūto*.

The age of the popular names “*The Law*”, or “*The Law of Moses*”, or “*The Book of the Law of Moses*”, and the like is not known for certain.<sup>3</sup>) Earlier passages

<sup>1</sup>) But compare what was said on laws in narrative form, vol. I, pp. 222 and 235 ff.

<sup>2</sup>) Gamla testamentet I. The theory is based upon the investigations of Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I* (1943).

<sup>3</sup>) cf. the evidence referred to by Pfeiffer, p. 129: “The Pentateuch” first appears in Origen's commentary on John 4,25, but was presumably used by the *Hellenistic Jews of Alexandria* during the first century, as the equivalent of the Talmudic expression “the five fifths of the Law,” meaning the Pentateuch written in five volumes; when written on one scroll, it is called “the Book of the Law”. Cf. also Eissfeldt, p. 170.



like Ezra 10,3, 2 Chron. 30,16, Neh. 8,3, 2 Kings 14,6 may be understood as allusions to the legal parts only, not to the complex as a whole. The earliest use of such names of the whole "Law" appears in the *New Testament* e.g. in the frequent phrase "the Law and the Prophets", "the Law" being the first part of the Canon. The same usage seems to be found in the preface to the book of *Sirach*. Similar considerations are valid concerning the term "*The Book of Moses*". But it is possible that passages like Dan. 9,11,13 already give evidence of the comprehensive meaning of the words.

The contents of the five books are a *narrative of the history of creation and salvation up to the time of the death of Moses*, the laws forming parts of the narrative, inserted in places believed to relate their historical origin.<sup>1)</sup>

## AUTHORSHIP

### *The traditional view.*

The Law does not contain any information concerning its author. *Moses* is only said to have written certain passages (Ex. 17,14,24,4,7; 34,27; Num. 33,2), the laws of Deut. (cf. 31,9), and the Song of Moses (Deut. 31,19). In New Testament times the idea of *Moses* as author stands out clearly, and the same is of course the case both in the writings of *Philo*, *Josephus* and, later, in Rabbinic literature and the *Church Fathers*. But it is most probable that the tradition of *Moses* as the author of the Pentateuch has been accepted earlier, cf. Ben Sira (Ecclus. 24,23), Daniel (9,11,13).<sup>2)</sup>

Early evidence of doubts concerning the *Mosaic authenticity* is found in *Origen's* reference to the rejection of both authenticity and unity by *Porphry* and *Celsus* (Contra Celsum IV, 42). Other Church Fathers (*John of Damascus*, De haer. XIX; *Epiphanius*, Adv. haer. XXXIII, 4; *Clementine Homilies* III, 47) relate the theories of certain *gnostics*, doubting the *Mosaic authorship*<sup>3)</sup>.

In the Middle Ages some *Jewish authors* cautiously gave hints of doubt. *Abraham Ibn Ezra* (1088–1167) relates that a certain rabbi *Isaac* (possibly *Isaac of Toledo* (982–1057)<sup>4)</sup>) dated Gen. 36,31 in the reign of *Jehoshaphat*; and *Ibn Ezra* himself, although pretending to oppose *Isaac* most energetically,

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 262.

<sup>2)</sup> For more details, see *Pfeiffer*, p. 134, referring to passages in the *Gospels*, *Philo*, *Josephus*, and to the important Talmudic paragraph, *Baba bathra* 14b, stating, in contradiction to *Philo* and *Josephus*, that *Moses* did not write the verses relating his own death.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 135.

<sup>4)</sup> *Pfeiffer*, p. 135.

in very sophisticated language points out some passages (Gen. 12,6; 22,14; Deut. 31,9; 34,1-12; and Deut. 1,1) contending against the Mosaic authorship<sup>1</sup>).

These and similar problems were also, during the century of the Reformation and later, seen by men like *Karlstadt* (1520) and – among the Roman Catholics – *A. Masius* (1574), *B. Pereira* (ca. 1600), *J. Bonfrère* (1625 and 1631). – Later *Thomas Hobbes* (1651) and *Spinoza* (1670) carry on the criticism begun by these men, and of great importance is also the work of *Richard Simon* (1678) and *Clericus* (1685)<sup>2</sup>).

The results of the activity of these forerunners of modern criticism from the 18th and 19th centuries we may sum up as follows.

*It cannot be proved that Moses must be the author of the Pentateuch.* Even if all Biblical passages speaking of “the Law of Moses” and the like should refer to the Pentateuch as a whole, it would only tell us that, at the time when they were written, much later than the time of Moses, people believed Moses to be the author. They are not proofs of authenticity, but witnesses to a tradition, the correctness of which is to be proved. The same holds good concerning the passages telling of Moses writing certain parts of the Pentateuch.

On the contrary, *it can be proved that Moses cannot be the author of the Pentateuch.* The narrative parts speak of Moses in the third person, and it is not possible to prove why Moses should write anonymously. And even an anonymous writer would certainly not praise his own humility (Num. 12,3), or exalt himself as in Dt. 34,10-12, cf. Num. 12,7 f., and Ex. 11,3. – Dt. 34,10-12 is one of the passages proving that the author lived after the time of Moses. They look back to that age, and compare it with the author’s own days. The frequently repeated formula “unto this day” (Dt. 3,14; 34,6; 10,8) belongs to the same category. Already *Ibn Ezra* murmured his doubts concerning Gen. 12,6; 13,7, cf. also Ex. 15,15-17; Lev 18,24-27; Dt. 2,12. – “The land of the Hebrews”, Gen. 40,15, is an anachronism. Place-names like those of Gen. 14,14; Dt. 34,1; Num. 32,41; Dt. 3,14 according to Judg. 18,29; 10,14 originated after the time of Moses. The author of Gen. 36,31 writes during the period of the monarchy in Israel. Num. 21,14 ff. quote a source dealing with the story of the time of Moses. In Gen. 50,10 f.; Num. 22,1; 32,32; 35,14; Dt. 1,1,5; 3,8; 4,46 the land *East of the Jordan* is called the land on the other side of the Jordan, which proves that the author lived West of the Jordan – where Moses never set his feet. The same thing follows from the way in which the narrative of the wanderings in the desert speaks of the four corners of the world: The author is living in Palestine.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Dubnow*, *Weltgeschichte des jüdischen Volkes* IV, p. 381 f.

<sup>2</sup>) *Pfeiffer*, p. 136 f. and our first vol. p. 10 f.

And finally, the *Pentateuch is no unity*. In spite of all differences of opinion concerning the origin of the present Pentateuch it cannot be assumed that one man stands at its beginning as "author". *Gerhard von Rad* rightly speaks of its "Unförmlichkeit"<sup>1)</sup>. The *doublets* (cf. below), the awkward way in which some pieces *break the continuity* of the narrative (Gen. 38 in the context of the Joseph-story has the effect of a dog among ninepins); the *stylistic* differences pointing not only to differences of place in life, but to different manners of story tellers; the different phrases with character of *fixed formulas*; the *theological* differences and contradictions, witness to a mixture of traditions from many sources, this word here used without the special meaning of the "documentary hypothesis". The Pentateuch reminds one of a mediaeval cathedral which by good fortune has escaped the vandalism of rigorous restorations and therefore now stands with all its different styles mixed up, so that a very trained eye is needed to discover the original plan. And nevertheless, there is a plan.

## ATTEMPTS TOWARDS A SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM OF COMPOSITION

### *The History of Pentateuchal Criticism.*<sup>2)</sup>

The oldest hypothesis trying to explain the origin of the "shapelessness" of the Pentateuch is the so-called *First or Older Documentary Theory*. It was founded by the French physician *Jean Astruc* in his book *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse*. (1753). The criterion of separation was above all the different *Divine names* *Yahweh* and *Elohim*. From the title it can be seen that he sticks to the *Mosaic origin* of the book, but assumes that Moses has used several documents.

He had forerunners in *Richard Simon*<sup>3)</sup> and *H. B. Witter*. The former regarded the Pentateuch as a compilation from a great number of documents, the latter, whose work had been forgotten, only found different documents in the story of the creation<sup>4)</sup>. The theory of *Astruc* was further developed by *Eichhorn* who not only used the criterion of the

<sup>1)</sup> Theol. Blätter 1935, col. 251. <sup>2)</sup> cf. Appendix.

<sup>3)</sup> *Hempel*, Die althebr. Lit., p. 3.

<sup>4)</sup> *H. B. Witter*, Jura Israelitarum in Palaestina (1711), cf. *Ad. Lods*, Jean Astruc et la



different names of God, but also examined the *literary character of the sources*, attempted to explain the work of the *redactor*, and above all, more and more abandoned the theory of the Mosaic authorship. The first to discover that there are two “*elohistic*” documents was K. D. Ilgen<sup>1)</sup>, but his discovery was completely forgotten and not revived until Hupfeld in 1853 wrote his book on the sources of Genesis. But Ilgen also prepared the way for other theories by his complete dissolution of the book in 17 independent documents.

The *Fragment Hypothesis* which accordingly came to the front was propounded by a British Roman Catholic priest Alexander Geddes<sup>2)</sup>, followed by the German J. S. Vater<sup>3)</sup>, and above all by W. M. L. de Wette<sup>4)</sup> and his school, where the theory was combined with historical investigations. Among the outstanding ideas of De Wette the assumption that the law book found under Josiah (2 Kings 22) was Deuteronomy has been of first importance<sup>5)</sup>.

The consistent fragment theory, in the form of the complete dissolution of Genesis, could of course not persist. The criterion of the different names of God was still used, and the fragments were joined together in *two different circles* “the Yahwistic” and “the Elohist”. But in the long run this theory could not be satisfactory because it offered no explanation of the continuity which in spite of the “shapelessness” is apparent in the Pentateuch.

The *Supplementary or Development Hypothesis* was – after some time of debate when different modifications of the older theories were proposed – founded by Heinrich Ewald. As a young man of 19 he had written his brilliant book *Die Komposition der Genesis* (1823), trying to prove that Genesis is a unity<sup>6)</sup>. But in 1831, in a review<sup>7)</sup> of Stähelin, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Genesis* (1830), he proved that one of the two circles assumed by the fragment theory, the “Elohist” (i. e. what is now, by the New Documentary Theory, called P and E), exhibits good continual coherence and plan. This material, according to Ewald, is the *basic document*, (“*Grundschrift*”) which has been supplemented by parts of a younger document, the “Yahwistic”

<sup>1)</sup> Die Urkunden des jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs I (1798).

<sup>2)</sup> The Holy Bible I (1792); Critical remarks on the Hebrew I (1800).

<sup>3)</sup> Commentar über den Pentateuch (1802–05).

<sup>4)</sup> Dissertatio critica, qua Deuteronomium a prioribus pentateuchi libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris opus esse monstratur (1805). Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament II (1807).

<sup>5)</sup> The idea was not new; it had been propounded by Chrysostom, Jerome, Procopius of Gaza, Hobbes and Lessing (Hempel, ZATW 1925, p. 299, n. 2).

<sup>6)</sup> For other works on the subject from the twenties and thirties of the nineteenth century, cf. Pfeiffer, p. 138.

<sup>7)</sup> in Theologische Studien und Kritiken.

parts. This theory was accepted e.g. by *Bleek*<sup>1)</sup>, *Tuch*<sup>2)</sup>, and the very influential *Franz Delitzsch*<sup>3)</sup>.

Later, *Ewald*<sup>4)</sup> assumed two "Elohistic" narrators, combined and supplemented by one "Yehovistic" author and so gave rise to a combination of the older documentary theory and the development hypothesis, represented by *Knobel*<sup>5)</sup> and *Schrader*<sup>6)</sup>.

The step back to the *Documentary Theory* was then taken by *Hupfeld* in his book, alluded to above, *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung* (1853), where *Ilgen's* "second Elohist" was rediscovered.

The *New Documentary Theory* (so called to distinguish it from the older forms of *Astruc* and *Eichhorn*), which has held its ground down to our days, when new points of view are coming to the front, was developed by *Hupfeld* as follows: He assumes *three independent sources in Genesis*, the so-called "first Elohist" (nowadays "P"), the "second Elohist" (the "E" of our times), and a Yahwist (our "J"). These documents have been combined by a fourth hand, a redactor ("R"). When Deuteronomy is taken into account, we have the pattern of the "theory of four sources" now generally assumed.

The *dating of the sources* by *Hupfeld*, indicated by the sequence of the three sources given just now, was accepted in principle and more thoroughly built up in the famous, still very important commentaries of *A. Dillmann*, covering the whole Hexateuch (1875 ff.), and of *Franz Delitzsch*<sup>7)</sup>, who now abandoned the theory of *Ewald*. But most important was the work of *K. H. Graf*.

Before reviewing his and the work of his more famous followers, we must, however, note that the development chiefly on German soil during the first half of the 19th century of course had its parallels in other countries. In *England* such work gave occasion for the attacks on bishop *Colenso* of Natal<sup>8)</sup>. And further it must not be forgotten that along with the critical we find in all countries a stream of *confessionalistic theology of reprobation*, reacting against the rationalism of the 18th century by returning to ecclesiastical tradition also in questions of Biblical criticism. In Germany it was led by the diarch *Hengstenberg*; in England should be mentioned *Pusey*<sup>9)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> *De libri Geneseos origine* (1836).

<sup>2)</sup> *Kommentar über die Genesis* (1838).

<sup>3)</sup> in his commentary on Genesis from 1852. *Delitzsch* later abandoned the theory.

<sup>4)</sup> in his *Geschichte Israels* (1843-55).

<sup>5)</sup> *Commentaries on Exodus and Leviticus* (1857) and on *Numeri-Josua* (1861).

<sup>6)</sup> in his revision of *De Wette's Einleitung* (1869).

<sup>7)</sup> *Pentateuchkritische Studien* (*Zeitschr. für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben* 1880).

<sup>8)</sup> *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua* (1862 ff.).

<sup>9)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 12.

From ca. 1860 the problems of composition are no longer in the foreground<sup>1)</sup>. The crucial point was now the *dating of the sources*.

A firm ground had been laid by *De Wette* through his dating of Deuteronomy in the 7th century B.C. (the reform of Josiah). *Hupfeld* had advocated a sequence of sources illustrated by the formula PEJ (we apply the sigla for the sources now in use). Forerunners of the revision of the question of date is a series of scholars working in the first half of the century. Ca. 1830 *Ed. Reuss* in some theses not printed till later and then 1833–34 in his lectures had maintained that the “basic source” (the “Grundschrift”, our “P”) did not stand at the beginning, but at the end of the evolution<sup>2)</sup>. Independently of Reuss the same idea had been put forward by *Vatke* in 1835<sup>3)</sup> and *George*.<sup>4)</sup> This theory was then developed by the disciple of Reuss<sup>5)</sup>, *K. H. Graf*, in his important book *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (1866). He had however not noticed that in placing the legal parts of the “Grundschrift” (“P”) later than the Deuteronomistic, but regarding its narratives as ancient, he allowed himself an impossibility. The review of his book by the Dutch scholar *Kuenen* opened his eyes<sup>6)</sup>.<sup>7)</sup>

That *Graf* was right was made clear to scholars mainly through the influential works of two scholars, *Abraham Kuenen* and *Julius Wellhausen*. In popular speech the “Reuss–Graf–Kuenen–Wellhausen theory” is shortly called the “Wellhausen theory”, and under this name it has conquered the world. But it ought not to be forgotten that it does not owe its triumph to a brilliant work by a methodically extremely well-trained philologist in Germany, the famous *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* of *Wellhausen*. English, American, French, Dutch and Scandinavian literature from the end of the 19th century

<sup>1)</sup> Important are the clear analysis to discern the “first Elohist” (our “P”) in *Th. Nöldeke*, *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments* (1869), the analytic work of *Wellhausen*, *Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher* (*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* 1876–77; 3rd ed. 1899), and the mostly forgotten work of *Ad. Jülicher*, *Die Quellen von Exodus I–VII*, 7 (Diss. Halle 1880); *Die Quellen von Exodus 7,8–24,11* (*Jahrbücher für prot. Theol.* 1882, pp. 79–127 and 272–315).

<sup>2)</sup> Cf. *A. Causse*, *La Bible de Reuss* (1929), p. 23, n. 44, quoting the words of *Reuss* himself on the question.

<sup>3)</sup> *Die biblische Theologie I*.

<sup>4)</sup> *Die älteren jüdischen Feste* (1835).

<sup>5)</sup> cf. the correspondence between Reuss and Graf, ed. by *Budde* and *H. I. Holtzmann*.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. his essay in *Merx's Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments* 1869, pp. 466 ff.

<sup>7)</sup> Important is also an analysis by *Kosters*, *De historiebeschouwing van den Deuteronomist met de berichten in Genesis-Numeri vergelijken* (1868), cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 139.



exhibits a stately array of investigations and works of synthesis by famous scholars<sup>1)2)</sup>.

The formula of dating is no more PEJD, but JEDP. The theory in its simplest form may be summarized in this way<sup>3)</sup>: The source J (ca. 850 B.C.) and the source E (ca. 750) were woven together as JE by a redactor (R<sup>JE</sup>) about 650; the Law of Deuteronomy from 622 (D) about 550 was – by another redactor (R<sup>D</sup>) – added to the work of R<sup>JE</sup>, and the Priestly Code (ca. 500–450) about 400 was worked into the previous bulk of material by the last redactor (R<sup>P</sup>).

But this form of the theory is only a simplification. Most critics consider the sources composite and split them up into separate documents. Both in J and E double versions were assumed at a comparatively early date<sup>4)</sup>. Already Reuss, Schrader, and Kuenen had contested the unity of J, and K. Budde in 1883 separated J<sup>1</sup> and J<sup>2</sup>. Smend<sup>5)</sup> in 1912 tried to prove that these sources run through the Pentateuch, while Eissfeldt in his Hexateuch-Synopse (1912) proposed the siglum L (“Lay source”) for J<sup>1</sup>. Also E was split up in different strands (E<sup>1</sup> and E<sup>2</sup>), and the same was attempted in both Deuteronomy and P. All this shows that the history of the older documentary theory from ca. 1800 is repeating itself: *The New Documentary Theory is tending towards self-dissolution.*

This of course is hailed with great joy by its antagonists. Fundamentalists of different shades have always – wrongly – considered the Documentary Theory one of the corner stones of Biblical criticism, denounced as impiety and unbelief, and the name of Wellhausen is sometimes named in tones as if he were Antichrist himself. The views of rigid orthodoxy was represented by the Papal Bible Commission<sup>6)</sup> and e.g. by W. Möller<sup>7)</sup>, Bissel<sup>8)</sup>, Green<sup>9)</sup>, Finn<sup>10)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> Driver, Addis, Carpenter and Harford, Bacon; Westphal; Kuenen; Buhl, Stave.

<sup>2)</sup> It is commonly stated that Wellhausen, influenced by the Hegelian Vatke, pictured the development of Israel on the Hegelian evolutionary scheme (see e.g. Albright, in *The Study of the Bible today and to morrow*, ed. Willoughby (1947), p. 171 f., cf also G. E. Wright, *ibid*, p. 87). In *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (2nd. ed 1946) Albright gives his arguments, but also states that scholarship is in debt to Hegel forever (p. 53). The idea was set forth in Johs. Pedersens article in ZATW 1931 (p. 171). F. Boschwitz, Julius Wellhausen. Motive und Masstäbe seiner Geschichtsschreibung (1938) – cf. Theol. Rundschau 1948–49, pp. 327f.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. Pfeiffer, p. 139f. <sup>4)</sup> cf. Pfeiffer, p. 140. <sup>5)</sup> Die Erzählung des Hexateuchs.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. the correspondence between Briggs and von Hügel, The Papal commission and the Pentateuch (1907); Mängenot, L'authenticité Mosaïque du Pentateuque (1907); Bea, in *Biblica* 1935, pp. 175–200 (but cf. the Appendix).

<sup>7)</sup> Die Einheit und Echtheit der fünf Bücher Mosis (1931).

<sup>8)</sup> The Pentateuch (1885), containing an excellent history of criticism up to that date.

<sup>9)</sup> The Unity of the Book of Genesis (1895). <sup>10)</sup> The Unity of the Pentateuch (undated, ca. 1917). Cf. also Young, Aalders and others – see The Evangelical Quarterly 1950, pp. 154–158.

From the Jewish side the orthodox view is defended vigorously by Rabbi J. Hertz<sup>1)</sup>, cf. *Jacob's* commentary on Genesis from 1934. A sworn enemy of the "Wellhausen" theories was the English-Jewish lawyer H. M. Wiener, who published many articles and books on problems especially concerning Deuteronomy. *Dahse*<sup>2)</sup> with the help of the LXX would weaken the weight of the criterion of the different Divine names. Against him *Skinner* wrote his excellent book *The Divine Names in Genesis* (1914).

But also *critical scholars* repelled the theory of sources. The highly original, learned B. D. Eerdmans (d. 1948) of Leiden in his *Alttestamentliche Studien I-IV* (1908-14)<sup>2a)</sup> rejected the criterion of the different names of God and denied the existence of sources running all through the Pentateuch. He assumed four stages of evolution from polytheism to purely monotheistic religion. The *Fragment Theory* was renewed by Löhr<sup>3)</sup>. The unity of the Pentateuch was maintained without theological interest in the Mosaic authenticity by the learned orientalist Halévy<sup>4)</sup>, by Cassuto<sup>5)</sup> and Dornseiff<sup>6)</sup>, while Klostermann<sup>7)</sup> developed a theory which Eissfeldt<sup>8)</sup> happily characterized as a process of crystallisation. In Denmark Johs. Pedersen abandoned the documentary hypothesis in its usual form<sup>9)</sup>. His last results may be summarized as follows<sup>10)</sup>: In the laws of the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy we have evidence of the Israelite assimilation of a Canaanite form of life. In the Code of Holiness we find the genuine Israelite conception of life. The Deuteronomistic laws are adapted to the claim concerning the cult in Jerusalem, with which also the Priestly Code deals. The cult laws have developed during the existence of the temple, have been altered in the course of time and have got the form in which they have come down to us in post-exilic times. The narrative material of Exodus and Numbers has been moulded on old traditions, but the contributions of different ages cannot be discerned through external literary

<sup>1)</sup> The Pentateuch and Haftorahs (finished 1936; cf. the review by F. A. Levy in *The Study of the Bible today and tomorrow*, ed. Willoughby, pp. 99 ff.).

<sup>2)</sup> *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage* (1912).

<sup>2a)</sup> cf. *The Composition of Numbers* (in *Oudtestamentische Studien VI*, 1949).

<sup>3)</sup> *Untersuchungen zum Hexateuchproblem I: Der Priesterkodex* (Beihefte z. ZATW 1924). <sup>4)</sup> *Recherches Bibliques I-II* (1895-1901). <sup>5)</sup> *La Questione della Genesi* (1934).

<sup>6)</sup> *Antikes zum Alten Testament* (ZATW 1934, pp. 57-75; 1935, pp. 153-71; 1937, pp. 27-36). <sup>7)</sup> *Der Pentateuch* (1883); *Neue Folge* (1907). <sup>8)</sup> p. 183.

<sup>9)</sup> *Israel, its Life and Culture I-II* (1926); *III-IV* (1940), cf. ZATW 1931.

<sup>10)</sup> cf. the review by J. C. Jacobsen in his edition of *Buhl's* (Danish) *Det israelitiske Folks Historie* (1936), p. 75.



separation, but only through an internal estimation of the material. It is not certain that the parts of Genesis attributed to the Priestly Code, which are easily separated from the rest, form an independent, coherent work, and it is doubtful whether Yahwist and Elohist in Genesis can be considered two continuous sources. It is possible that works, collecting laws, cultic legends, myths and history in coherent representations have existed during the period of the kingdoms; but there is no necessity for the assumption that such a work has been compiled before the exile, and we cannot reproduce such older works.

– The older criticism which dominated the last part of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, and which was founded on the New Documentary Hypothesis in the form it had got after the work of the “Wellhausen school”, tried to extend the theory of the sources through the historical books of the prophetae priores. Especially J and E were followed up through the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings<sup>1</sup>). This idea, started by K. Budde in his commentaries on Judges and Samuel<sup>2</sup>), led to the theory of the so-called *Deuteronomistic Work of History*, comprising the older sources JE and the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings in the shape given to them by the Deuteronomistic redaction<sup>3</sup>). On account of the reaction against the Documentary Theory which set in during recent years this theory too was thrown into the melting pot. And independent investigations on the separate books, e.g. the commentary on Joshua by M. Noth (1937) and Rosi’s analysis of Sam. in his important *Die Ueberlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids* (1926) have contributed to another view of the process of redaction. Like most of the theories which we are now going to review, these works are still under consideration in current discussion. A clear picture of the present situation is not easily given.

The *New Documentary Theory* is still held by the majority of scholars, e.g. by Hölscher (*Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung* (1942)) and also in the extensive work of Pfeiffer (1941), and in the Danish edition of the present work from the same year. Like Eissfeldt and Smend, Pfeiffer finds a source running parallel to the J document, but only in Genesis (Smend found his J<sup>1</sup> throughout the Hexateuch, and Eissfeldt attempted to trace his L document up to

<sup>1</sup>) As examples we mention the works of Hölscher, *Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen und seine Redaktion* (in *Eucharisterion...* Hermann Gunkel.. dargebracht.. (1923), pp. 158ff.) and *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1941–42).

<sup>2</sup>) cf. his monograph *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel* (1890).

<sup>3</sup>) cf. below.



the story of David). This source he calls "S", for "South" or "Seir", denoting the idea of *Pfeiffer* that this source comes from Southern Palestine and winds up with a summary of the history of Edom (living in Seir) before the time of David. *Pfeiffer* further finds some redactional additions and isolated stories, which he calls "S<sup>2</sup>".

Most scholars also accept as the pivot of *dating* the sources the theory of *De Wette*, that Deuteronomy, or its oldest parts – for here too different strata were found<sup>1)</sup> – must be connected with the reform of Josiah (622). But other ideas have been put forward, especially by *Hölscher*<sup>2)</sup> who dates the book ca. 500 B.C.<sup>3)</sup> Others like *Oestreicher*<sup>4)</sup> and *Welch*<sup>5)</sup> try to push back the Code to an earlier date.

Concerning the *individual documents* *Volz* and *Rudolph*<sup>6)</sup> have tried to prove that E is no coherent "source", but mostly parts of or supplements to J<sup>7)</sup>.

Recently, two important contributions to the discussion have been published. First, we have to mention *Noth's* *Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* [8]. Here he examined the Deuteronomistic Work of History, maintaining that it is not demonstrable in Genesis-Numbers. It starts in Deuteronomy and tells the story of the continuous apostasy of Israel in Palestine down to 587, explaining the meaning of Israel's history. It is thought to be the work of a Palestinian private individual. The "Hexateuch" sources do not go beyond Joshua, and even there they cannot be identified with certainty, especially not P, that seems to ignore the traditions of the conquest of Palestine<sup>9)</sup>.

While *Noth's* work in principle keeps up the Documentary Hypothesis, the stimulating sketch in *Engnell's* *Gamla testamentet, en traditionshistorisk*

<sup>1)</sup> Most influential was the commentary of *Steuernagel* in *Nowack's* series (2nd ed. 1923).

<sup>2)</sup> ZATW 1923. <sup>3)</sup> He has been followed by *Mowinkel* and *Johs. Pedersen*.

<sup>4)</sup> Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz (1923).

<sup>5)</sup> The Code of Deuteronomy (1924); Deuteronomy, the Framework to the Code (1932).

<sup>6)</sup> Der Elohist als Erzähler, ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik? (1933). *Rudolph*, Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Josua (Beih. ZATW 1938); reviews: *Humbert*, Theol. Lit. Zeitung 1938, col. 415ff. *Eissfeldt*; Deutsche Lit. Zeitung 1934, col. 127ff.

<sup>7)</sup> Mainly on lines similar to *Smend* and *Eissfeldt* works *C. A. Simpson*, The Early Traditions of Israel (1948); cf. the review by *Rowley* in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1948, p. 138ff. *Eissfeldt*, Die ältesten Traditionen Israels (Beih. ZATW 1950).

<sup>8)</sup> Schriften d. Königsberger Gel. Gesellsch. (1942); Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch (1948).

<sup>9)</sup> On the work of *Hölscher* (Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung) and *Noth*, see the criticism of *Eissfeldt*, in Die Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament (1948). This book also contains some pages on the work of *Simpson*, The Early Traditions of Israel (cf. above, n. 7). *Eissfeldt* also refers to *von Rad*, Der Anfang der Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament, Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 1944, pp. 1-42. On *Winnett*, The Mosaic Tradition (1949), see Book List of the Soc. for OT Study 1950, p. 47.

inledning I (1945), brings in new points of view of great importance. He follows *Noth* in his determination of the extent of the Deuteronomistic work (Deut. – 2 Kings), separates Gen.–Numbers as the “*Tetrateuch*” from the rest of the books, and regards them as a great compilation of traditional material from different times. Their final literary redaction must probably be placed in a relatively late age, but the material is upon the whole ancient and nowhere later than the period of the kingdoms<sup>1</sup>). While *Noth* maintains P as the literary basis of the “*Tetrateuch*” with which the old “sources” J and E have been combined through a “redaction”, *Engnell* thinks it more natural to regard “P” simply as the last “tradent”, the editor of the “P-work”, i. e. the “*Tetrateuch*”. This “P” contains also the collections of legal material, the material reality behind “P”, and has also given the whole work its theological character.

In the *Tetrateuch* as in the Deuteronomistic Work (by *Noth* and *Engnell* called “Dtr”) *Engnell* distinguishes two groups of material, narratives and laws, from one another. This leads him to postulate that Gen. on one hand and Exod.–Num. on the other are independent complexes of tradition, with their own strong, individual character and their own history of tradition. On the other hand *Engnell* underlines that simultaneously there runs a continuous thread of narrative material all through the books till the death of Moses (which he thinks was originally told at the end of Num.). The disparate character of the traditions reveals itself through doublets, variants etc. But he denies that these differences can be used to discern coherent “documents”, “sources”, in the meaning of literary criticism. The task of the history of tradition must be to find and determine the smaller units and the special traditions. But this is very difficult and will often give only approximative results.

The narrative material has lived for long ages in *oral tradition* of different circles of story-tellers. Of this history we know nothing definite, and we are only able to guess concerning eventual metamorphoses and combinations. We only know the material in the form it received from the hands of the last story teller, the collector or editor. But it is a common rule in the history of oral traditions that this last “tradent” generally is very faithful to his material and only undertakes changes which are absolutely necessary. This must have been the case with “P”, the last “tradent” in the “*Tetrateuch*”, as is also shown by the material. As usual in the work of an Oriental “recensent” P will have taken up what he has found, in quite unaltered form.

Among the narrative material *Genesis* has a position apart<sup>2</sup>), and it is

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Nyberg*, in *Världsrreligionernas kärnord*, p. 121 f., quoted by *Engnell*, p. 209.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Johs. Pedersen*, *Israel I–II*, p. 22.

doubtful whether it has anything to do with the other collections. The traditional material of Gen. belongs to different cycles of traditions with the *patriarchal legends* as their centre. Among these the Abraham- and Jacob-cycles are most prominent. To the Jacob-cycle is attached, in a natural way, through the migration of Jacob to Egypt, the Joseph-complex. Engnell thinks that the results of Gunkel's analyses of the individual stories and the legend-cycles are generally justified. It is also true that the stories were originally cultic legends, connected with different sanctuaries, and that they belong to "schools of story tellers" which have left the traditions untouched to a very great extent. – Before the story of the Patriarchs the *Primeval Story* has been placed in order to give the cosmic perspective: The Primeval Story<sup>1)</sup> from a "theological" point of view ends in an open question concerning the relations of God to all mankind, a question which is answered through the combining verses Gen. 12,1–3. – Gen. is again only an introduction to the quite different material which we encounter in *Exod.-Num.* This material is introduced by "the second Primeval Story<sup>2)</sup>", the cultic *Passover Legend*, Ex. 1–15, not in its original form, but in a "de-culticized", "historicized" representation, the "Urform" of which it is imposible to reconstruct, but which contains reminiscences of the historical events at the Exodus and the crossing of the Red Sea<sup>3)</sup>. – In *Num. 10,11* the legends of the wanderings begin again, telling of the wilderness period and its "stationes". The next characteristic complex of traditions is *Num. 22–24*, the *Balaam* stories, followed by new legends of the wanderings in Moab. They are as before frequently interrupted by law material and end in the story of the distribution of the land among the tribes (ch. 34), and presumably the "Tetrateuch" originally then told of the death of Moses.

In adherence to Kaufmann<sup>4)</sup> Engnell then gives some hints of a dating of "P". He asserts that P has a directly positive view of the kingdom: Moses, the primeval king, not Aaron, is the central figure, and the centralisation of the cult is not, as assumed by the "Wellhausen" school, a tacit presupposition. On the contrary P is a bama-cult codex, which Judaism only with difficulty was able to adapt to the idea of centralisation<sup>5)</sup>. The stylistic formalism (the

<sup>1)</sup> cf. v. Rad, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs* (1938), p. 66, and Budde, *Die biblische Urgeschichte* (1883), p. 409 – quoted by Engnell.

<sup>2)</sup> Johs. Pedersen, *ZATW* 1934, pp. 161 ff.; *Israel III–IV*, pp. 297 ff.; 545 ff.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. Hvidberg, *Den israelitiske Religions Historie* (1943) p. 50. (= *Haandbog i Kristendomskundskab*, udg. af Bentzen, Feveile, Hansen, Koch, Mosbech, Plum, II, p. 234). – Cf. on Gen. 1–3 Ringgren, *Svensk Exeg. Årsbok* 1948.

<sup>4)</sup> *ZATW* 1930, pp. 23 ff. <sup>5)</sup> Kaufmann, p. 32.



genealogical pattern etc.) is no sign of late origin, nor are the archaisms secondary and artificial etc.

The *legal material* in Ex.-Num. has another origin and another history than the narrative parts. It grows out of oracle-giving and judicial functions at the sanctuaries, their priesthoods in their ideological connection with the Divine kingship. And in this field of literature we have to take into account an early *written* tradition of different legal corpora, without excluding a continued oral transmission alongside the written material. In adhesion to *Pedersen*, *Welch*, and *Oesterley-Robinson Engnell* stresses the different origin of the law-collections against the narrative parts. The local origins of the different collections can only be hypothetically fixed, but their peculiarities are most naturally explained as evidence of locally differing circles in the Israelite community<sup>1)</sup>, not as evidence of different epochs. The collections are different complexes of traditions, e.g. the "Book of the Covenant" (Ex. 20,23-23,19) and the collection of 34,17-26. - An independent complex is the so-called "Code of Holiness" (Lev. 17-26), belonging to the greater collection, generally called "P"'s laws. It contains not only cultic, but also social and ethical laws and is a peculiar mixture of ancient and new material, of very old legal rules and late constructions, imbued with a tendency to reaction against Canaanite life. Its present form it has got in post-exilic times, but its material has been formed in the old days of tribal chiefs and kings. While the Book of the Covenant exhibits strong Canaanite influence on Israelite ways of life, the Code of Holiness shows us genuine Israelite culture and its attempts to keep out Canaanite conceptions of life.

- In determining the *age of the "Tetrateuch"* we must distinguish clearly between the age of the material and the final redaction. The latter seems to have taken place in post-exilic times, the age of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*. We cannot determine, whether the Tetrateuch is older than "Dtr", but only that they are different, e.g. that "P" represents a Southern, "Dtr" a Northern tradition, and that the "Tetrateuch" contains much more ancient material than D.

"Dtr" has been circumscribed by *Noth*, who also has shown the unity of Dtr. It is the Deuteronomist himself who gives this unity to the disparate complexes of tradition and elements of tradition contained in Dtr. He therefore ought to be called "*author*". But he always allows his sources to speak freely, always occupying a positive position towards the traditions known to him. The *core* of his traditions is the *legal material of Dt. 4,44-30,20*. It has grown up

<sup>1)</sup> *Johs. Pedersen* I-II, p. 28.

like the laws of the Tetrateuch from cultic and judicial practice. Old and New is mixed up in those laws of custom, the older being strongly influenced by Canaanite life, while the Deuteronomist himself is strongly anti-Canaanite. Engnell assumes that the material to the greatest extent is of *Northern* origin<sup>1</sup>). But in the form imposed upon it by the Deuteronomist it is dominated by the claim of the centralisation of the cultus to Jerusalem. This claim and the anti-Canaanite tendency give the laws a strongly unreal character, which is enforced through the circumstance that they are given in the name of Moses and therefore must have a "futuristic" form.

Engnell's ideas concerning the narrative element in Dtr. can only be summarized here as far as they concern the Pentateuch. The first literary unit is the recapitulation of the events of the wanderings in the wilderness, composed by the Deuteronomist himself in the form of a speech of Moses (Dt. 1, 1-4, 43), the last part of which (4, 1-10) develops into a general introductory speech to the laws. Also among these we find inserted parenthetic-didactic and moralizing sections in the characteristic deuteronomistic style. In like manner Deuteronomy is concluded by a speech of Moses (31, 1 ff.), which gives the Deuteronomist occasion to take up the thread of his narrative which had been broken by the collections of laws. Then follows the hymnic conclusion (cf. 32) and the cultic special tradition in ch. 33. The whole is wound up with the narrative of the death of Moses (ch. 34). - In *Joshua* the Deuteronomist has used the great complex of traditions 1-11, generally called the "Landnahme-geschichte" by German scholars. Engnell accepts with some reservations the ideas of *Noth*<sup>2</sup>), but he values the work of the Deuteronomist higher and thinks that it has been of more influential character. Against *Noth* he also considers 13-21 an element taken up by the Deuteronomist. Ch. 22 is a special tradition, and 23-24 are - like ch. 1 - the work of the Deuteronomist. A variant of the "Landnahme-geschichte" is *Judg.* 1, 1-2, 5, but not of J, as generally assumed by literary criticism.

The present situation concerning the question of the Pentateuch - according to the short review now given - is rather in suspense. Especially among scholars of the younger generation there exists a definite scepticism towards the Documentary Hypothesis.

But another thing also must be noticed: There often seems to be no real

<sup>1</sup>) He refers to *Hulst*, *Het Karakter van den Cultus in Deuteronomium* (1938), my *Die josianische Reform* (1926), and *ZATW* 1933, pp. 173 ff., my *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie* (1931), *Lindblom*, *Israels religion i gammalttestamentlig tid*, p. 153 f., and others, without deciding his own opinion on the circles of origin.

<sup>2</sup>) He rightly refers to the works of *Albrecht Alt* and *Möhlenbrink* (cf. below p. 83).

understanding of the problems that led to the establishment of the hypothesis. And on the other hand, very often the new solutions offered are very sketchy. Too often we get postulates and not arguments, often accompanied by rather unpleasant, scornful words against the maintainers of other views.

In a handbook of Introduction to the Old Testament it must be of first importance to teach students the whole import of the "old school", so that continuity in science can be seen and the new points of view get their true background<sup>1</sup>). Our criticism of them, and our attempts at a solution of our own we must then view in the light of the insecurity of the present situation, as attempts, not as final words. We are living in an age, where new theories are about to be born.

### THE DOCUMENTARY HYPOTHESIS, ITS BASIS AND ITS METHODS

The problem which the Documentary Hypothesis attempts to solve is the problem of the "Unförmlichkeit" of the Pentateuch (*v. Rad*).

Continually we encounter perplexing *repetitions*, e.g. the double tradition of the creation, containing *contradictions* which seem to exclude the possibility of one man as originator of both. Twice it is told that Abraham to save his life pretends that Sarah is his sister, a motif which is also used in a story of Isaac and Rebecca. The genealogy of Seth is given in two forms (Gen. 4,25 ff. and 5,1 ff.). The naming of Bethel in Gen. 28 is told in connection with Jacob's escape to Mesopotamia, in ch. 35 in the tale of his return, and likewise the altering of his name is given in two different situations (Gen. 32 and 35). Ishmael's age is given differently in Gen. 23,5-6 and 16,16. It is difficult to understand that the same story-teller in Gen. 6,19 makes God order Noah to take one couple of all sorts of animals into the ark, while he 7,2 without commenting remarks tells us that Noah took seven couples of the clean, one couple of the unclean animals with him. Gen. 11,31 Abraham goes out to come to the land of Canaan, but 12,1 he is ordered to go to an unknown country, which Yahweh will point out to him. While Abraham and Sarah in Gen. 18,11 are so old that they do not expect to have children, the strong

<sup>1</sup>) This historical work is done in *Mowinkel's* book *Prophecy and Tradition* (1946), pp. 5ff.; cf. the review by *Eissfeldt* in *Theol. Lit. Zeitung* 1948, cols. 529ff. See above all *C. R. North*, *Pentateuchal Criticism*, in *The OT and Modern Study*, ed. by *Rowley* (1951).



old man in 25,1 takes another wife and begets six sons. Gen. 37,25 Joseph is sold to Ishmaelite merchants, while in v. 28 he is stolen out of the well into which his brothers had thrown him, by Midianite merchants.

From the following books of the Pentateuch it is also possible to gather a bunch of similar phenomena. The father in law of Moses is known under two names (Ex. 2,16–18, Num. 10,29, cf. Ex. 3,1; 18,1). Especially the narratives of the call of Moses to liberate Israel are significant, because they, like the stories of creation, contain irreconcilable contradictions both between themselves and in relation to other passages of the Pentateuch. The call is related in two places, Ex. 3 and 6. – 3,15 Moses learns the name of Yahweh, but 6, 2 ff. it is again revealed to him, and in a form showing that the story teller – in contradiction to Gen. 4,26, cf. Gen. 15,7 – presupposes it to be unknown to Israel before Moses. According to 4,20 Moses takes his wife with him on his return to Egypt., in 18,5 she is brought to him, after he had left Egypt at the head of the liberated Israelites. – After the destruction of the tablets of the Law (Ex. 32) we expect the new ones (Ex. 34) to contain the same precepts as related in Ex. 20 ff. But a different collection of commandments is introduced. – One must have a very peculiar conception of space to reconcile the idea of the place of the holy tent and the ark in the middle of the camp (Num. 2; Lev. 10,4; 17,3 ff., etc.) with that of Num. 11,24,26,30; Ex. 33,7 where the tent is pitched outside the camp.

We could continue this for a long time. The miracle of the quails is told twice (Ex. 16 and Num. 11), likewise the test at Meriba (Ex. 17,1 ff. and Num. 20,1 ff.), and the election of Moses's assistants in the government of the people (Ex. 18,13 ff. and Num. 11, cf. Dt. 1).

It is true that such variants and contradictions do not prove the documentary hypothesis, and not even always that there are different traditions behind the books. Oral tradition works with repetition<sup>1)</sup>. But it is an exaggeration, when Cassuto<sup>2)</sup> tells us that his supposed "maestro di altissimo genio" who has collected the old traditions has built them up as a harmonious whole, forming a narrative which is "an organic and well-together-welded unity". The two creation-stories cannot be reconciled, and the same is true of the two stories of the call of Moses, the two conceptions of the place of the ark and the tent. And even if many of the criteria by which literary criticism splits up stories like Gen. 34 may be due to what Engnell calls "writing-desk-lo-

<sup>1)</sup> See Engnell, p. 191.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. Engnell, p. 191 f. n. 3. Cassuto, *La Questione della Genesi* (1934), p. 393 f.

gicism”<sup>1)</sup>, this cannot be applied e.g. to the number of clean and unclean animals in the ark of Noah and other instances. To mention the example which *Engnell*<sup>2)</sup> singles out, the difference between Gen. 18,11 and 25,1 referred to above: This is not explained by modern “psychology of the primitives” by saying that in 18,11 Abraham is an individual, in 25,1 a “collective”, standing as name embracing the tribes or clans emanating from him.<sup>3)</sup> There are two, originally separate traditions here, combined by a collector, who was able to combine – perhaps – because he regarded the patriarch from the standpoints of primitive psychology.

What has been said here can also be repeated concerning the *differences of style*. We have parts of the Pentateuch where we find a heavy, circumstantial style, while in other passages the material is presented in an easy flowing, living narrative. There are differences in the conception of God (Ex. 4,24 ff. comp. with Gen.1) etc.

But as said above, all this does not lead to the Documentary Hypothesis. It might as well be explained by the Hypothesis of Fragments or in the way preferred by *Engnell*.

In the Danish edition of this book I have taken up a hint given by *Humbert*<sup>4)</sup>. There are certain phenomena of different kinds occurring again and again, grouping themselves in such a manner as to combine the different traditions to form the collections which literary criticism calls “sources” or “documents”, and which – if we accept the modern theories of oral traditions – serve as indicators which must group the oral traditions in a way leading to much the same results as literary criticism has led us to, even if we cannot establish an unbroken line of narratives, so as to extract whole separate “books” from the bulk of the Pentateuch.

<sup>1)</sup> *Johs. Pedersen*, in *Israel I-IV* has given many examples of this in his notes. But I must confess, that I am not convinced e.g. concerning Num. 16-17 and Ex. 14 (for the latter chapter I still think that my examination, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1938 has shown that *Buhl* (*Til Vejledning i de gammeltestamentlige Undersøgelser* (1895), p. 28f.) was right in assuming even three threads in the text). Concerning Ex. 1-15 I refer to the remarks of *Vriezen*, *Israelitische Geschriften* (1948), pp. 120ff.

In *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1947 (a congratulation volume to *Lindblom*) *Nyberg* has attempted a similar analysis of Num. 16-17, which does not convince me. I think that he too often only re-tells the story, plastering over the difficulties. Deut 1,5ff., cf. Ps. 106, 17, gives a form of the legend where the Qorah-sections are missing. This proves the combination of at least two strata in Num. 16-17.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 192.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Puikko*, *Teologinen Aikakauskirja. Teologisk Tidsskrift*, Helsinki, 1947, p. 68.

<sup>4)</sup> in his recension of *Rudolph's Der Elohist von Exodus bis Josua* in *Theol. Lit. Zeitung* 1938, cols. 414ff.

Such a “constant” – as these phenomena are called by *Humbert* – is the *clear plan* visible in the Pentateuch in spite of its manifest “shapelessness”. There is a *scopus* in the story. It aims at a definite conclusion, the fulfilment of the Divine promise to the Fathers, the conquest of the Holy Land. This is emphatically stressed by *v. Rad*<sup>1)</sup>. *Engnell*<sup>2)</sup> rightly has noticed that this argument on my side above all is directed against all sorts of fragment hypotheses. I have said no more. The plan, “the scarlet thread” which leads through the bulk of traditions, is the first indicator showing us that if we are to distinguish between the traditions we must look for “constants” along this line.

The first “constant” which was noticed was the peculiar changes in the use of the *Divine names*<sup>3)</sup><sup>4)</sup>. It is possible that a collector of legends reports two variants of the same story, e.g. Gen. 12,10 ff. and 26,1 ff., especially when they – as the two just mentioned – exhibit certain circumstances leading the collector to the assumption that they described different situations. This might also explain the reception of the third variant in Gen. 20. But here it seems difficult to explain, why the author – or story-teller or collector – upon the whole consistently says *Elohim*, while in 12,10 ff. and 26,1 ff. he says *Yahweh*. Here “*Yahweh*” is “constant” in one of two parallel recensions, *Elohim* in the other.<sup>5)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuchs. It was this constant which *Ewald* used against the Fragment Hypothesis in 1831, and which the adherents of this hypothesis in their turn had acknowledged, when they (cf. above p. 13) used the constant of *Astruc* and *Witter* (cf. p. 12): The peculiar use of the Divine names in Genesis.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 195.

<sup>3)</sup> *Vater* (III, p. 464 – cf. above, p. 13) says that the Pentateuch shows more “Zusammenhang der Begebenheiten als Zusammenhang der Bücher”, cf. also his valuable methodical remarks p. 470: “Blos zufällig kann eine solche, so gleichbleibend und so oft sichtbare Verschiedenheit nicht sein. Wenn es auch nicht an sich ganz unmöglich ist, dass ein Verfasser sich ein Mal des Namens *Jahwe*, das andere Mal des Namens *Elohim* bedient habe, welches vielmehr selbst aus Stellen deutlich wird, wo beide Gottesnamen abwechselnd gesetzt sind: so bringt doch wenigstens der ausschliessende und charakteristisch gehäufte Gebrauch eines von jenen Gottesnamen die überwiegende Wahrscheinlichkeit hervor, dass dies eine stete Gewohnheit eines solchen Verfassers und ein Merkmal sei, woran er wieder erkannt werden könne, wenn nicht vielleicht dieser verschiedene Gebrauch selbst von Orts- und Zeitverhältnissen abhing. Dass aber jemand absichtlich in dem einen Stücke gleichbleibend den einen, in dem andern den andern Gottesnamen gesetzt hätte: dies wäre eine viel zu künstliche Annahme, zumal da dies nicht von einem oder ein paar Stücken, sondern von vielen gelten müsste.”

<sup>4)</sup> *Engnell* does not discuss this criterion at length, but only refers to the opponents of its use. He does not mention the book of *Skinner*, *The Divine Names in Genesis* (1914), where e.g. *Dahse* and *Wiener* are properly dealt with, cf. *North*, op. cit. p. 79.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. *Skinner*, op. cit. pp. 184ff. – *Kapellrud*, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts* (1952), p. 46, deals very cavalierly with the problem, cf. below, p. 29, n. 1 and the *Appendix*.



The change in the use of the Divine names is however more than a simply linguistic "constant". It is a *material* "constant". We know that its use, at least in Genesis and in the beginning of Exodus, follows a definite plan. Pfeiffer's words<sup>1)</sup>, "The clue discovered by Astruc is not only obvious but given in plain language in Ex. 6,2-5 (although he did not notice it there)", cannot be refuted<sup>2)</sup>. The three passages Gen. 4,26; Ex. 3,15, and Ex. 6,3 witness to at least two strata of traditions—they may be oral or written, the result is the same<sup>3)</sup>—one of which represents the theological theory of the name Yahweh having been known to men from the time of Adam's grandson, the other believing that this holy name was not revealed till the time of Moses<sup>4)</sup>. Ex. 6,3 accurately corresponds to the fact that in some parts of Genesis (17,1; 28,3; 35,11; 48,3) God reveals himself to the patriarchs under the name of *El shadday*. This proves, that e.g. Gen. 15,7, where God appears to Abraham with express use of the name Yahweh, cannot come from the same hand or mouth.<sup>5)</sup> Accordingly, in the parts of the Pentateuch from Gen. 1 to Ex. 6 we must be entitled to use the criterion of the Divine names to distinguish between different traditions.

But inside Ex. 3-6 there are some verses which in like manner seem to presuppose that the name of Yahweh was not revealed until the time of Moses, without connection with the name of *El shadday*. The name is here only given as a hint through a popular etymology. This does not fit in with the explicit emphasis with which it has been given in Ex. 6<sup>6)</sup>.

The name *El shadday* also occurs in passages which have no connection with Ex. 6,2 ff., e.g. in Gen. 43,14, in a context, generally attributed to E. The name *Shadday* is an old Divine name (Gen. 49,25; Num. 24,4,16), also in later days used in poetry (e.g. in Job). It has been taken up by the systematically minded P to mark the progress in the story of revelation (*Elohim* until Gen. 17, then *El shadday* till Ex. 6, and then *Yahweh*). Of course we must reckon with scribal errors, with the possibility that collectors and redactors at the rims of the pieces combined were "infected" by usage in the different pieces. But we must also take into account that some deviations may be used on purpose. As an example of this I shall point to Gen. 17,1, where it is generally

<sup>1)</sup> p. 137.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Hammershaimb*, in *Haandbog i Kristendomskundskab* II, p. 164f.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. I, p. 105, II, p. 30.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Kuenen*, *Einleitung* I, p. 58, n. 26.

<sup>5)</sup> *Buhl*, *Til Vejledning*, p. 28.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. *Mowinkel*, in *Det gamle Testamente oversatt av Michelet, Mowinkel og Messel*, ad. loc., and *Kuenen*, *Einleitung*, I, p. 57, n. 22.

supposed that "Yahweh" has come in through a scribal error<sup>1)</sup>. But more probably P here wants to tell his readers: "The God whom we since the days of Moses know as Yahweh revealed himself to Abraham...": P wants to stress the unity of God, just as Christian theology maintains the identity of the God of Israel and the Father of Jesus Christ. – Of course we also must expect that the criterion of the Divine names becomes more uncertain after Ex. 6, all "sources" now being able to use the name Yahweh. But even here it does not disappear, for "Elohistic" custom is supported by the tendency of later ages to use Elohim<sup>2)</sup>.

To the criterion of the changes in the use of the names of God *other linguistic criteria* attach themselves as "constants", accompanying the use of the names of God in such a manner that it makes the idea of different parallel stories more probable. Thus the Yahwistic pieces mostly use the word *Sinai* as designation of the mountain of revelation, the Elohistic mostly the word *Horeb*. Some *Elohistic* sections, however, also say *Sinai*. But these sections appear, on other grounds, to be connected with complexes speaking of *El Shadday*. This is a sign of the justification of separating a *second Elohistic*, different from the *Deuteronomist*, who generally says *Yahweh*, but also uses the word *Horeb*. In the same manner we find e.g. that J calls the aborigines of Canaan "*Canaanites*", while E says "*Amorites*". A female slave who is the concubine of her master J calls *šifhāh* or *pilegeš*, E *'āmāh*. Of the concluding of a covenant P generally uses phrases indicating that God is the superior, nay, the sole ruler in the covenant (the covenant as resting on grace): *nātan* or *hēkēm b'ērīt*, while the older sources more commonly use the ancient expression *kārat b'ērīt*. – This linguistic material was very minutely worked out during the 19th century. We refer to the extensive linguistic tables of the individual sources, e.g. in the Introductions of *Driver* or *Steuernagel*<sup>3)</sup>. The linguistic and stylistic peculiarities of D and P are so apparent that it seems impossible to escape the weight of the material. And – in contrast to what was said in the Danish edition of this work – I feel inclined to stress these criteria more now, together with other *formal* characteristics: I think that the insight into the significance of *oral tradition* must be combined with the results of the *form-critical* investigations

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Driver*, Introduction, p. 21. That the change of Divine names "was simply a stylistic device" (*Kapelrud*, loc. cit.) which can be compared with phenomena in the Ras Shamra texts and the Psalms, is wrong. In the poetical pieces the names change irregularly, in the prose texts regularly.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Rudolph*, *Der Elohist von Ex. bis Jos.*, p. 103, where he admits (*Baentsch*) that the Divine names are used according to a definite plan.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. also the special Introductions to the Hexateuch by *Holzinger* (German), *Westphal*, (French), *Carpenter* and *Battersby Harford*.

carried on by the same men who introduced the traditio-historical point of view<sup>1</sup>).

Other – material – “constants” are *different ideas* in many fields. *Humbert*<sup>2</sup>) points to the description of *Joshua* in Ex. 17,8 ff.; 24,13; 32,17,18; 33,11 and in the book of *Joshua*; to the part played by the staff of Moses as criterion in the story of the plagues of Egypt and at the Crossing of the Sea etc. Such ideas, running through the material, contrasting with others in parallel sections, show that we have not to do with uncoordinated elements, but with originally parallel representations of the same material. And I stress, this is the case whether we work upon the theory of a written record or upon the idea of primarily oral traditions. Therefore these two points of view must necessarily be combined.

In connection with this the *religious, cultic, and moral ideas* play a great part. There are definite and relatively clear nuances distinguishing the theology of the different strata<sup>3</sup>). One enlarges the distance between God and man more than others: Gen. 16,4–14 compared with the parallel 21,8–21. These characteristics repeat themselves as “constants” in the Bethel-narrative in Gen. 28, where v. 13 shows us Yahweh standing on the earth beside Jacob<sup>4</sup>), while vv. 10–12; 17–18; 20–22 describe the revelation as a vision of angels on the ladder leading up to heaven. To this last stratum is joined Gen. 22,11, where the angel of Yahweh calls Abraham from heaven. In other sections the demeanour of men towards God corresponds to this: Ex. 3,5, compared with v. 6, 19,7; 20,18–21 compared with 19,12–13; 21–24. Similar characteristics are revealed in *ethical ideas*. The story-teller of Gen. 20,1 ff. tries to tone down the morally precarious in the conduct of Abraham, in Gen. 12,10 ff. – Gen. 30,29–43 seems to show, compared with 31, 4–16, that a now lost section of one stratum of the story of Jacob has told that his riches were not acquired through cunning shepherdcraft, but through the direct act of God. – The constants here enumerated especially contribute to the separation of J from E, the latter mostly representing the more cautious, more scrupulous, theologically more advanced thinker.

The theological “constants” are however also of special prominence in characterizing the later strata D and P. The cultic theory of P that all

<sup>1</sup>) Above all *Gunkel*, but also *Mowinkel*. Concerning the linguistic criteria, cf. also *Kräutlein*, *Die sprachlichen Verschiedenheiten in den Hexateuchquellen*, Dissert., Rostock 1907, and *Eissfeldt*, *Hexateuch-Synopse*, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. p. 26.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 20f.

<sup>4</sup>) To the meaning of *‘alaw*, see *Dillmann* and *Skinner* ad loc.



cultus originates from Moses explains that Gen. 7,2 only has one pair of all animals in Noah's ark, in contrast to the earlier stratum in the narrative (J) which already at this point of history talks of clean and unclean animals. In the same manner we must explain the fact that the earlier strata allow the building of altars and offering of sacrifices in many places in the country, while D underlines the commandment of cultic centralisation and P presupposes this institution (Ex. 20; Lev. 17; Ex. 25; Deut. 12). With this last example we have arrived at a phenomenon which not only contributes to the separation of the strata from one another, but also to their dating.

Finally it must be underlined – and still more strongly than in the first, Danish, edition of this book – that a too mechanical use of the method here described does not lead to the goal. Especially *the separation of E* is often very difficult and in some places impossible. It is desirable that scholars in our time would be as cautious as *Hupfeld* in his in this field epoch-making work, especially in the detailed attempts to find “sub-sources” in J and P. There are signs which can be explained in this way. But we must reckon with the fact – not first discovered by the “tradition-historians” of the forties of this century – that “in the mind of an Israelitic story-teller from the 9th or 5th century many things can lie beside one another which to us seem completely irreconcilable, and this the more as – concerning all sources – we always have to do with adaptation of narrative material handed down orally”<sup>1)</sup>. The latter point of view has to be stressed more urgently, because the insight into the manner of oral tradition which is so one-sidedly, but energetically studied by the Swedish school, must lead us to understand that we cannot with the optimism of the authors of the Polychrome Bible separate the “documents” by verses and half-verses. *I think we must stop speaking of “documents”*. I am deliberately more inclined to say “strata”, indicating that I am a little more optimistic concerning the task of getting behind the “last tradents”, back to the story-tellers whose traditions they have taken up in their collections. I think the truth of the documentary hypothesis must be accounted for in this way.

But we must also keep in mind that several cycles of legends and law-complexes already in early days had got *literary* form.<sup>2)</sup> Both in the primeval history, the patriarchal history (the Joseph-novel<sup>3)</sup>), the story of the wanderings and in the book of Joshua this possibility is to be taken into account. The primeval story to a great extent rests on traditions which had been taken

<sup>1)</sup> This is a free rendering of the words of *Eissfeldt*, *Hexateuch-Synopse*, p. 5.

<sup>2)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, *Einl.*, pp. 145 f.; 155 ff.; *Noth*, *Josua*; *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet I*, p. 225.

<sup>3)</sup> *Gunkel*, *Genesis*, pp. LXXXII ff.

down in writing in Mesopotamia long before the existence of an Israelite literature. The Ras Shamra texts are also evidence of literary activity in Palestine in old days. "Seit Astruc ist die irrigste und gefährlichste aller Pentateuchhypothesen: Die "mechanische Mosaikhypothese"<sup>1)</sup>.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STRATA

### *The "Priestly" Complexes (P).*

These parts of the Pentateuch are the sections which are most easily recognized. Originally they were not separated from other parts also using the Divine name *Elohim*, later considered a distinct source (E). They were thought to be the oldest parts, the "Grundschrift", therefore often abbreviated G, or A (Dillmann). Wellhausen often used the siglum Q (from quattuor, "Vierbundesbuch"), because he assumed four covenants in Genesis-Exodus, with Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Moses. Through the Grafian hypothesis they were assigned to the latest period in the history of the Law.

There are indications that P has been *compiled from several complexes*. Such indications are e.g. the different ideas of the relations between Priests and Levites. It is also generally admitted that the *legal parts* comprise older, originally independent collections, such as the Sacrificial Tora (Lev. 1-6, often styled P<sup>o</sup>), "the Code of Holiness" (Lev. 17-26, by the literary critics called P<sup>h</sup>) etc. But it is evident that here we have only nuances, probably from slightly different times, from the same "theological" circles. These differences of course have great historical, especially cultural historical, interests.<sup>2)</sup>

It is disputed if the stratum is mainly a *narrative* work or a *legal* compilation. A common apprehension has been expressed in the designation *The Priestly Code*. It has been understood as *Law*, only set in a very concise historical framework. More recent criticism accentuates the evidence of a real narrative in P, parallel to that of JE, and modern hypotheses mostly concentrate upon the contention that in the legal parts there has been some supplementing work going on. Literary critics often use the siglum P<sup>g</sup>, the letter g alluding to the parts of the stratum which are of historical ("geschichtlich") character and considered the basis ("Grundschrift") of the complex as a whole, disting-

<sup>1)</sup> Jülicher, *Jahrbücher für prot. Theol.* 1882, p. 106; cf. also the cautious words of Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, 6th. ed. p. 8, n. 2.

<sup>2)</sup> As examples I refer to my *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie* (Festschrift. udg. af Københavns Universitet Nov. 1931). chs. III and IV. - Von Rad, *Die Priesterschrift in Hexateuch* (1934) has attempted to separate two sources in P.

ished from the partly older (P<sup>h</sup>, P<sup>o</sup>), partly younger (P<sup>s</sup>) supplements. But what is the truth of the older view of P as a law-code must still be maintained: It is characteristic that the narrative becomes most detailed when a theological, especially a cultic, point of view comes into the foreground.

The word "Code" accordingly must be understood *cum grano salis*, and moreover it must be emphasized that also the designation "Priestly" must not be taken too exclusively. It comes from a period in the history of learning when scholars were inclined to understand the other (earlier) parts of the Pentateuch mainly as expressions of the religion of the prophets and viewed the spirit of P in contrast to them.<sup>1)</sup> When we see how D is strongly marked by priestly activity we must be obliged to use the designation "priestly" with some reservation. Of course P represents priestly interests. But it does not stand alone in this work. I prefer personally the label "the Aaronitic laws" on account of the prominent place taken by Aaron, the Aaronitic High Priest, differing from D (and also from the earlier complex in P, P<sup>h</sup>).<sup>2)</sup>

It is P which seems to give the present Pentateuch its plan. P has a firm *chronological framework*, to this day the basis of Jewish time-reckoning. It gives continually exact information about the age of the persons described and other dating. This chronology seems to be acquainted with the theory of *world-periods*, known in later Jewish literature, especially the apocalyptic writings<sup>3)</sup>.

The plan of the work also appears in the very strongly marked *division of the material*, indicated through the characteristic superscriptions *velehh tōl' dōt* (Gen. 5,1; 6,9; 10,1; 11,10; 11,27; 25,12; 25,19; 36,1,9; 37,2; Num. 3,1). Only in Gen. 2,4a does this formula not stand at the beginning of the section, but seems to be a subscription<sup>4)</sup>.

The work is not so realistic as the great exactness might lead one to believe. It has a very *artificial character*, sometimes developing into the grotesque.

<sup>1)</sup> Cf. the two great chapters in *Driver's* Introduction on the "prophetic" and the "priestly" narrative of the Pentateuch.

<sup>2)</sup> I do not say that Aaron is the central figure in P (cf. *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet* I, p. 222). It is not right to combine the central figure Moses with the king in P, for Moses has a place quite a part (cf. *Johs. Pedersen*, *Israel* III-IV, p. 662 f.; my *Messias-Moses redi-vivus-Menschensohn* (1948), p. 69, n. 3).

<sup>3)</sup> *Gunkel*, *Genesis*, 3rd. ed., pp. 264 ff., and the literature mentioned in my *Commentary on Dan. ch. 2*.

<sup>4)</sup> This plan according to some (cf. *von Rad*, *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch*, pp. 33 ff. and the literature quoted there) contains some difficulties which have been solved on the assumption that the toledoth-scheme was taken over by P from an earlier work containing some genealogies, and which was developed into the later P.



If the number of first-born, given in Num. 3,32, is right, every mother in Israel at that time must have had an average of 42 sons<sup>1</sup>). The work is full of that kind of improbability. To this belong the enormous ages reached by the antediluvian patriarchs. This rests on Babylonian material, giving still greater numbers of years<sup>2</sup>). – How could the 603550 men of the congregation (Num. 2,32) assemble before the door of the tabernacle, i.e. in the court of the sanctuary described in Ex. 27,18?<sup>3</sup>). Can a people of 2500000 have lived in the Sinai-desert for a longer time? Could the enormous quantity of sheep necessary for the correct celebration of Passover be nourished in the desert? Colenso has discussed these and other problems and repelled the apologetic art trying to clear up the difficulties. In certain cases we can see how speculation has created some of this material. The exorbitant number of warriors (Num. 1,46) has been found by means of *gematria*. The consonants of *bēnē jistrā'el* are read as numerals, added and multiplied by 1000, then the simple numerical value of the words *rō's kol* – is added. Result 603551, which is then rounded off to 603550.<sup>4</sup>) The chronology possibly rests on a combination of the theory of the world-periods (cf. above) and tradition concerning certain outstanding events, which were located at the beginning of the different periods. And the chronology is evidently an expression of some teaching. The periods are characterized by the diminishing age of men – which is also evidence for the circumstance that speculation, not tradition is the origin of the system, at any rate not historical tradition, the system being reminiscent of certain Oriental patterns (the Babylonian mythical king-lists).

Also the *description of the sanctuary* (the Tabernacle) is quite unrealistic. It is a re-dating of Solomon's temple in the time of the wanderings. P combines the traditions of the Holy Tent (Ex. 33) *outside* the camp with his picture of the cult-room of the temple, which he imagines as movable and covered by the tent. But if we draw a sketch according to this description, the result is a monstrosity like that pictured in *Beer-Galling's* commentary on Exodus<sup>5</sup>), where the tent cannot cover the inner, wooden house, the latter having too high walls. And in like manner the whole development of the cultus in P must be regarded. It has not been invented by P. Here as in other places the work rests on old traditions. But upon the whole P dates the cult back into Mosaic times. There cannot be talk of imposture. It is presupposed that the cult which is considered the correct one is also Mosaic. But there are at the same time *political aims* behind the work. It will regulate the cult and e.g. the differences between Priests, Levites, other cult-servants, and the layfolk. Here also the regulations concerning financial tributes of the people etc. get their proper light, and we are able to see P as representing not only one man, but also a "school" with quite definite aims. And that the material comes from different times is clear from the fact, e.g., that the "canonical age" of the Levites is given differently in Num. 8,24–25; 4,3–33, cf. 1 Chron. 23,24.

<sup>1</sup>) Colenso (cf. p. 14), I, pp. 84ff. His quotations exhibit a good series of examples of the ways in which these absurdities were explained away by orthodoxy.

<sup>2</sup>) Cf. Pfeiffer, p. 204. – I think that the difference between the names of the Babylonian and the Hebrew lists makes it impossible to assume that P had access to such lists. But "some sort of influence of the Babylonian lists on Gen. 5 cannot be gainsaid" (Pfeiffer, p. 205).

<sup>3</sup>) Colenso, pp. 31ff.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. the theory of the Levitical cities.

<sup>5</sup>) p. 135.

An important fundamental thought in the theology of P expresses itself in the chronological system mentioned before. P intends to state the relation between the *stadia in the revelation* to Israel. P's historical theory<sup>1)</sup> is that God through a series of covenants has regulated his relations with the human race. Even if the word "covenant" is not used in the creation story of P (Gen. 1) it is nevertheless true that this chapter represents a covenant with the first human beings, consisting in the delegation of world power to man, limited only by the regulation, that he is allowed only vegetarian food.<sup>2)</sup> Probably *Steuernagel* is right in his contention that the relation between the four covenants is that of promise and fulfilment. God enters into relations with all men through the first two, to Israel through the last two, of which the Sinai-covenant is a further development of the covenant with Abraham with its commandment to live irreproachably<sup>3)</sup>. And finally the promise of the possession of the land gets its fulfilment through the events narrated in the book of Joshua. The progress in Divine revelation is marked through the different *Divine names*, first the common *Elohim*, then the more special *El shadday*, probably understood as in the LXX, cf. Jes. 13,6; Joel 1,15; and at last *Yahweh*, peculiar to the special covenant between God and his chosen people. Essential for this theory of a developing revelation is also its definition of the relations between *cultus and ethics*. The latter as the important presupposition is found already in Gen. 5,24; 6,9 in the description of single persons and appears as commandment in the covenant with Abraham Gen. 17,1. In the pictures of the patriarchs P obliterates such features as are conflicting with this commandment (Gen. 13,6; 25,9; 28,1). But the climax of revelation is reached in the covenant at Sinai, where the cultus is revealed. Accordingly no cult is assumed in action before Moses. P therefore places the cultic laws higher than the ethical.<sup>4)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> P has in this respect his oldest known forerunner in the *Yahwist*, cf. my paper *Det israelitiske historiesyn*, Dansk Teologisk Tidsskr. 1944, pp. 155 ff.; cf. also C. R. North *The Old Testament Interpretation of History* (1946), pp. 108 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> Even if the word *b'ērit* is not used here, the chapter has the character of the concluding of the first covenant (against *Steuernagel*, Einl. p. 228); *Wellhausen's* siglum Q (cf. above p. 32) originates from his assumption of four covenants in P, of which Gen. 1 must contain the first (Composition, 3rd ed., p. 1).

<sup>3)</sup> *Eichrodt*, Theol. d. AT. III, p. 29.

<sup>4)</sup> That P also has ethical laws is quite clear to me, also that ethics are a self-evident presupposition. But that P values the cultus higher, cannot be denied. It follows from the place which the cultic laws occupy in the final revelation. I need not separate P<sup>h</sup> as a special "document" to maintain this (*Engnell*, Gamla testamentet I, p. 205).



Important is also the *conception of God* found in P. The idea of God is strongly transcendent, but exceptional anthropomorphisms give evidence of the strength of traditional material e.g. when it is told that man is created in the picture and likeness of God (Gen. 1,26 ff.)<sup>1)</sup> cf. 5,1 ff.; 9,6). But generally *anthropomorphisms* are avoided. God reveals himself, but never as in Gen. 18 (JE) in human form. When anything is said of the form of revelation, P talks of Yahweh's *kābōd*, which is – characteristically – veiled in a cloud (Ex. 24,16 f.) and only seen by the cult-founder Moses, in whom it has supernatural effects (Ex. 34,29 ff.). – An external expression of the distance between God and men is the *order of the camp* (Num. 2), where Priests and Levites as a wall of isolation stand between the sanctuary and the people. This is only one expression of the manner in which the clergy has become the mediator between God and the people. God speaks to Moses or at most to Moses and Aaron, not directly to the people. The direct activity of God always has the character of a flash of lightning, is completely isolated and sudden. Transcendence is turned into magic. In spite of this, however, heavenly mediating beings play no great part. Cherubs are mentioned, but without any significance in this direction. When a few anthropomorphisms have remained – cf. above and e.g. the *rē<sup>a</sup>h niḥō<sup>a</sup>h* in connection with sacrifices, or God's rest on the seventh day (Gen. 2,2; Ex. 31,17: "He rested to refresh himself", cf. also the phrase "God's bread" in Lev. 21) – the cause is that we here have fixed termini which could not be avoided and which in course of time had lost their original realism. Much is due to the fact that P to a very great extent draws upon traditional material of great antiquity<sup>2)</sup>, e.g. in the chapter on the creation<sup>3)</sup>, and in the story of the Flood. The idealization of the patriarchs is also limited by the traditional material – e.g. Gen. 17,16 ff., where Abraham doubts the promise, and the traditional etymology of the name of Isaac has been transferred from Sarah (Gen. 18, JE) to the patriarch himself. This P would certainly not have handed down, if he had not been bound by his material. But it is to be noted that this doubt in P just serves to emphasize the importance of obedient faith.<sup>4)</sup> Upon the whole the cultic material in P is ancient, involving that termini from less reflecting ages might remain in the complexes. But it must

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Engnell*, art. Adam in *Svensk Bibliskt Uppslagsverk* (1948).

<sup>2)</sup> This is rightly stressed by *Engnell* and others (cf. below, p. 64).

<sup>3)</sup> cf. the detailed review by *Pfeiffer*, pp. 192 ff. – Some of his arguments, however, in my opinion seem a little out of date, e.g. the reference to the verb *bārā'* as not occurring before Deutero-Isaiah. It occurs in the Psalms, which ideologically and stylistically are the forerunners of Deutero-Isaiah. But *Pfeiffer's* ideas on the psalms show that he has not been convinced by recent work in this field.

<sup>4)</sup> *Eichrodt*, *Theologie d. AT*, III, p. 29.



not be forgotten that P through the whole description of the history of Israel maintains the idea that *faith* is an essential expression of man's relation with God: Abraham's execution of circumcision is an act of faith, Noah's building of the ark likewise. The fate of the people and Moses and Aaron in the desert is determined by their unbelief, which does not make the covenant null and void, for it is the sovereign gift of God, which nevertheless brings judgments upon them<sup>1</sup>).

P's *style* is exceedingly easy to recognize. Rarely does it become monumental as in Gen. 1, where P in spite of the marks of learned mannerism<sup>2</sup>) has created a grand opening to the Bible, and very rarely does his narrative give a vivid picture of the Oriental milieu, as in Gen. 23. The style is – in Gen. 1 too – schematic, formalistic, full of recurring formulae, inclined to unnecessary going into details – e.g. Num. 7,12 ff., where the contents of a very long chapter might have been expressed in a couple of lines. The descriptions of the conclusion of covenants have been moulded in the complete form of contracts (Gen. 9 and 17)<sup>3</sup>). The sentences are overloaded with appositions, relative clauses, prepositional phrases. Often P's style may be recognized by the difficulty in translating such sentences<sup>4</sup>).

Peculiarities of P's *language* have been registered in earlier Introductions, especially extensively in that of *Driver*. We note that he prefers the construct *me'at* (100), that he places the smaller numeral before the greater, that he has a foible for the nota accusativi 'et with suffixes. In dating, P does not use the names of the months, but numbers. He has peculiar geographical expressions as Paddan Aram, Sinai (not Horeb), and names of countries are nearly all combined with the word 'ereṣ.<sup>5</sup>)

### The Code of Holiness (Ph)

This name for the collection of laws in Lev. 17–26 was introduced by *Klostermann*<sup>6</sup>). That it is a code which has had its own existence before being

<sup>1</sup>) *Eichrodt*, op. cit. p. 29.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. the commentary of *Gunkel*, pp. 116ff., also *Wellhausen*, *Prolegomena*, 6th ed. p. 296f., *Pfeiffer*, p. 195.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 211.

<sup>4</sup>) *Steuernagel*, p. 233. – Cf. also *Pfeiffer*, p. 208f.

<sup>5</sup>) For other peculiarities of glossary I refer to Introductions and commentaries. I want to emphasize that this is not because of my contempt for this material. On the contrary, I hold that with modern stressing of the prominence of *oral tradition* it must also be important to pay attention to linguistic and formal criteria, stock phrases and the like. The *form-critical method* must not be neglected – as was pointed out by *Mowinckel*, *Prophecy and Tradition* (cf. above, p. 29f.).

<sup>6</sup>) *Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol.* 1877, pp. 401ff.

incorporated in P results from the fact that it has a clear concluding section of a form known from other law books. Unlike P<sup>g</sup> it not only contains cultic laws, but also what we call ethical commandments ("thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself", Lev. 19,18), and "civil laws", e.g. rules of forbidden degrees in marital relations (Lev. 18 and 20). Its cultic personnel is not organized in quite the same way as in P<sup>g</sup>,<sup>1)</sup> above all the High Priest here is not the High Priest of P<sup>g</sup>, but a *primus inter pares*. The name "The Code of Holiness" is founded upon the phrase <sup>14</sup>nī JHWH, often enlarged by *m<sup>e</sup>ḳaddiškem*, *m<sup>e</sup>ḳaddēšō*, or *m<sup>e</sup>ḳaddēšām*. Linguistically P<sup>h</sup> has mostly the same characteristics as P<sup>g</sup>, from which it must be inferred that it belongs to the same circles. But its linguistic character in relation to P is somewhat difficult to determine, because we must take into account that it has been worked over by its incorporation into P. That P<sup>h</sup> in its turn is no quite homogeneous unity again appears from the fact that it contains doublets (e.g. chs. 18 and 20). It stresses the claim of centralisation in a way differing from Dt. (ch. 17), and its hierarchic system seems to indicate a somewhat older stage of development than P<sup>g</sup>.<sup>2)</sup>

#### Other peculiar sections of P.

As mentioned above, Lev. 1-8, the sacrificial *tōrāh*, often called P<sup>o</sup> (from German "Opfer", "sacrifice"), seems to be an originally independent collection. It is proved by the subscription 7,37 f.<sup>3)</sup> A category of the same kind is also the so-called "*tōrāh* concerning clean and unclean" (Lev. 11-15) and the law concerning the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16)<sup>4)</sup>. The latter festival not being mentioned in Neh. 8,13 ff. the sections of Lev. 16 which treat this festival are generally considered later than Ezra, and therefore later than P<sup>g</sup>, often assumed to have been introduced by Ezra. But we do not know, whether the Day of Atonement was celebrated in the year of Ezra's reform or not. We cannot work on an *argumentum e silentio* in this matter<sup>5)</sup>, and accordingly a dating will appear to be premature. Nor do we know anything of the law introduced by Ezra, and whether he introduced a law

<sup>1)</sup> cf. my *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie*, pp. 13 f. and 37 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. op. cit. p. 38.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. I, p. 220.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. Löhr, *Das Ritual von Lev. 16* (1925) (in *Schriften der Königsberger gelehrten Gesellsch., geisteswiss. Kl.*).

<sup>5)</sup> The Ezra-narrative has no interest in relating anything concerning the Day of Atonement, because it has no significance for the work of Ezra (*Egon Johannesen, Studier over Ezras og Nehemjas Historie* (1946), p. 299, with references to Welch, *ZATW* 1929. p. 131, my article in (*Dansk*) *Teologisk Tidsskrift* 1921, p. 22, *Bertholet*, p. 72).

at all.<sup>1)</sup> It is more natural to suppose that most of the *material* contained in these sections are old rules from the temple, collected and incorporated in the work of P.

### Remodellings of P.

It has been pointed out above that scholars generally find several examples of differing opinions in P. Not only the Levitical canonical age is given differently<sup>2)</sup>. The rank of the priests in like manner is not always determined in the same way. Num. 18,7 seems to allow *all* priests to enter the Holy of Holies, in Lev. 16 only the High Priest is admitted to this part of the sanctuary. This may mean only, that in Num. 18 all priestly duties are mentioned, so that there is no discrepancy<sup>3)</sup> – an example showing that “discrepancies” may be dissolved by a little more exact consideration of the meaning of the text. More to the point is it when it is noted that, while the High Priest in Ph and the earlier parts of Pg is the only priest who is anointed, all priests undergo this rite in the later parts (Ex. 28,41; 29, 7,21; 30,20; Lev. 10,7) etc. But we must here emphasize the duty of caution. It is very difficult to discern later additions in a compilation mainly belonging to the same school. It is very probable that the law on the *incense altar*, which comes awkwardly late in the description of the sanctuary (Ex. 30; Num. 10), has been added in later times. But when we come to details, scholars disagree to a high degree on these matters. As mentioned before, we have here to do with things stamped by the same circles as Pg. Accordingly it is more appropriate to stress the coherence, even if the separation of such elements can have its great significance for the understanding of the history of the cultic personnel et. al.

That the *incense-altar* is a post-exilic innovation was assumed by Wellhausen (Prolegomena (1905), pp. 61 ff.). Several scholars have offered strong criticism of this position. But the archaeologist Albright (The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible (1931), p. 108f.) proves that archaeology supports Wellhausen and the results of the Documentary Hypothesis. On the other hand he stresses that P's innovations must have roots in tradition (p. 161).

### Deuteronomy (D)

The siglum *D* used in Pentateuchal Criticism is derived from *Deuteronomium*, and it is thereby underlined that this source is especially found in the Fifth

<sup>1)</sup> Egon Johannesen, op. cit., pp. 294 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 34.

<sup>3)</sup> Holzinger, (in Kautzsch, Die Heilige Schrift d. AT, 4th ed., ad loc.), cf. also Dillmann.



Book of Moses. *Noth and Engnell*<sup>1)</sup> think that it is the beginning of the so-called "Deuteronomistic Work of History" (Dtr.), comprising the historical books of the prophetae priores, at least in their main parts. In the Pentateuch we have no deuteronomistic narrative as in P, except the historical introduction to Deuteronomy (1-4)<sup>2)</sup>. In the Pentateuch D is mainly the *law book of Deuteronomy*. Scholars generally assume a deuteronomistic redaction of the Pentateuch, taking the whole Pentateuch to have been incorporated in the Deuteronomistic Work of History, to which P was later added. But it must be admitted that the traces of the deuteronomistic redaction in the four first books ("The Tetrateuch" of Engnell) are very scanty in comparison with the books outside the Pentateuch, where this material may be separated rather easily in Jos., Judg. and Kings, especially in the so-called "framework"<sup>3)</sup>. I think that there are distinct traces in Ex. 13<sup>4)</sup>, further in 22, 20-23; 23,9,11 b; 23,24-26; 23,32-33; 33,2; 34,11; 34,15-16; 34,24; Num. 21,33-35; 32,33,40, and perhaps more. But in certain cases it seems uncertain, and at least it is not enough to refute the theory of *Noth*. The traces of deuteronomistic phraseology in Ex.-Num. do not prove a deuteronomistic redaction of the books, but at most deuteronomistic work upon some sections.

D(euteronomy) has the form of a *Farewell-Speech*<sup>5)</sup> of *Moses*. This applies mainly to the specifically deuteronomistic parts of the present book of Deuteronomy, which stand out clearly beside the sections of other sources, especially in the last chapters.

To P are generally assigned: 1,3a; 32,48-52; 34,1a; 34,7-9. To E: 10,6-7; 27,5-7; 31,14-15; 31,23a; 34,1b-4. Besides some additions from R<sup>D</sup> and R<sup>P</sup> are pointed out. The source D accordingly is found in 1,1-2; 1,4-4,40; 4,44-10,5; 10,8-27,4; 27,8-31,13; 31,16-22; 31,24-30; 32,1-47; 34,5-6; 34,10-12. The *Blessing of Moses* (33) is independent, and the *Song of Moses* (ch. 32) has also been independent before being taken up into D.

Within D attempts have been made to separate several other *strata*. Especially *Steuernagel*<sup>6)</sup> tried to show that an *original Deuteronomy* ("Urdeuteronomium"), D<sup>1</sup>, was published in several later editions, D<sup>2abc</sup>, which were subsequently combined. Others think that an original code in the course of time was

<sup>1)</sup> cf. above pp. 19 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. above, p. 23.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. below, pp. 87, 96.

<sup>4)</sup> vv. 3b; 5; 9; 11; 14; 16.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. I, p. 206 f.

<sup>6)</sup> Der Rahmen des Deut. (1894). Die Entstehung des deut. Gesetzes (1896). Deuteronomium und Josua (commentary, in *Nowack's series*, 2nd ed., 1923). Cf. also his Einleitung, pp. 172 ff. and 189 ff.

supplemented with more material<sup>1)</sup>. The main criterion in this separation, which accordingly may take the form either of a documentary or a development-hypothesis, but in most cases presents a combination of both, has been the *changing forms of address*. The speeches address the people partly in the second person in the singular, partly in the plural. The uncertainty of this criterion has however been proved by *Sperber*<sup>2)</sup>, who has made it clear that this is a stylistic device known in other parts of Semitic literature.

*Wellhausen*, *Steuernagel* and others assumed that the original law only comprised chs. 12–26<sup>3)</sup>. But this is probably a mistake. Already ch. 6 gives “laws and commandments”<sup>4)</sup>. But before this chapter the law always had an *historical introduction*. This introduction seems to be preserved in two forms, viz. 1,1–4,44 and 4,45–5,31. It is uncertain with which of these the historical material in chs. 9,10 and 11 is connected<sup>5)</sup>. The *concluding speeches* (chs. 28–30) also exhibit a certain amount of parallelism indicating doublets. At any rate a concluding speech ends in 28,69, and we have a fresh start in 29–30. Here 30,1 manifestly proves the exilic date of the words, speaking *ex eventu* of the captivity. Ch. 27 too is generally considered composite.<sup>6)</sup>

The complex problems of *Dt. 27* cannot be treated here in detail. The chapter seems to contain earlier, probably *Shechemite* material. It may be supposed that we here have a section which after the catastrophe of 609, that in the eyes of many Jews discredited the reform of 621 as displeasing to Yahweh, attempts to stress the *Shechemite* traditions against *Zadokite Jerusalem*. It was perhaps re-introduced after 609.

In this chapter is imbedded the small *Dodecalogue of curses*, on account of its contents often styled “the sexual Dodecalogue”. Concerning this type we refer to vol. I, p. 221f. The *date* of this small corpus is not certain. *Eissfeldt* (p. 240) thinks that some items place it near P. I should perhaps say P<sup>h</sup>. But *Eissfeldt*’s opinion, that 27,15–16 must be later than P<sup>h</sup>, I cannot find conclusive. There are some similarities. But it is probable that 27,15–26 is a *parallel* to certain sections of P<sup>h</sup> (Lev. 18 and 20), which has been incorporated in the deuteronomistic context in the same manner as the law on clean and unclean animals (*Dt. 14*), also found in Lev. 11. In this addition to the law the Deuteronomists have

<sup>1)</sup> *Hempel*, *Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums* (1914); *Hölscher*, *ZATW* 1923. Cf. also *Pfeiffer*, p. 187; “Deuteronomy represents the final result of a series of editorial expansions beginning in 621 and ending about 400 B.C.” He assumes 4 editions, from 621,600–550, ca. 550 and 500–450, + some redactional sections.

<sup>2)</sup> *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 1918, pp. 23 ff. cf. *Mowinkel*, *Le Décalogue* (1927), p. 14, n. 2. Concerning *J. H. Hoppers*, *De numeruswisseling in het boek Deuteronomium* (1942), see *Vriezen*’s review in the *Book List of the Society for OT Study* 1948. – *Hoppers* apparently does not know the article of *Sperber*.

<sup>3)</sup> *Wellhausen*, *Composition*, 3rd ed., p. 190f.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. my *Die Josianische Reform* (1926), pp. 35 ff. *Mowinkel*, *op. cit.* p. 13.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. *Mowinkel*, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. *Die Josianische Reform*, pp. 85f., 105f.

taken up some ritual material, as is seen also in the preceding chapter, among other things also the small collection of regulations, the concluding anathema of which of course was interpreted as pointing to the deuteronomistic law.

Concerning the relations between Dt. 27,1-8 (cf. 11,29f.) and Jos. 8,30-35 the reader is referred to the commentaries, and particularly to *Mowinkel*, *Psalmenstudien V* (1924), pp. 74-80 and 97-112.

But as in the case of P it must be noticed that this stratification is not of great significance. The same spirit pervades the whole law, and the distinction of an original nucleus is of less importance<sup>1</sup>).

Like P, D has a very characteristic *style*. It appears not so much in vocabulary as in recurring *phrases*, sometimes consisting in whole sentences. In a way not quite usual in the Pentateuch the law speaks of "love of God" (6,5; 7,9 etc.). This is, as *Driver* in his fine analysis of the style of D has pointed out, a characteristic principle in D. The same is true of the emphasis laid on the notion of God's love for the people.<sup>2</sup>). Peculiar to D are not the different styles of law, but the *homiletic*, admonishing language. This is expressive of the fact that the book has a definite character of preaching a definite apprehension of Israel's relations to Yahweh.

For like P, D has a clear *theological programme*. Its chief points are expressed in the famous sentences of the *Shema*, 6,4 ff., the Jewish confession of faith, which its martyrs, e.g. Rabbi *Akiba*, recited in their hour of death, "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might". To this point corresponds the *law of the sanctuary* in 12,1 ff., commanding Israel to worship Yahweh in one place only, i.e. the *centralisation of the cultus*. The unity of the sanctuary is a consequence of the unity of God. The commandment: Yahweh is one, does not express theoretical monotheism. The law says that besides Yahweh other divinities exist, possessing the relative right that Yahweh has left the other nations to them, that they may worship them (4,19, cf. 32,8 LXX). Yahweh is their superior, he is "God in the superlative" (cf. 10,17). The dogma of the unity of Yahweh must be understood in relation to that of the sanctuary. It is polemic against the tendency to plurality brought into the idea of God by the plurality of sanctuaries. - But besides Yahweh is a *jealous God*, forbidding his people to worship the gods to whom he has given the other nations (5,14 f.). This "intolerance" is especially directed

<sup>1</sup>) *Buhl*, *Det israelitiske Folks Historie*, 7th ed. by J. C. *Jacobsen* (1936), p. 326, cf. my *Studier over det zadok. præsteskabs hist.*, p. 22; *Die Jos. Ref.*, p. 34f.

<sup>2</sup>) The stock phrases of D have been collected by critics and catalogued many times. We refer above all to *Driver's* Introduction.



towards the *Canaanite* gods, of which Israel is commanded to erase all traces (12,2 ff.). "Tolerance" towards foreign gods is only shown the divinities of nations farther off, with whom Israel is allowed to conclude covenants. Those near to Israel, i.e. the Canaanites, must be exterminated to the last man and woman, in order to prevent Israel from learning to worship their gods (20,17 f). Therefore we hear of severe laws against every form of *Canaanite cultus* (7,1 ff.; 7,36 ff.; 12,2 ff.; 29 ff.; 13,1 ff.; 16, 21f.; 17,2 ff.; 18,9 ff.). The *masseboth*, still in use in JE (Gen. 28,18), are denounced Dt. 12,3; 16,22, together with the *ʿaserim* which had always been prohibited. But Yahweh is not only "a consuming fire, a jealous God" (4,24; 9,3). The great and terrifying God, possessor of heaven and earth, is also the *loving* God who "had a delight in thy fathers to love them" (10,15) and the people of Israel. He "did not" – however – "set his love upon" Israel, "because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people" (7,7); nor did he do it "for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thine heart" (9,5); but because he loves Israel, loves its fathers and will keep his word to them and punish the sins of the Canaanites. He is "God of gods, and Lord of Lords, a great God, a mighty, and a terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward" (10,17). But he also "doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and the widow, and loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment". This God of Love Israel is to imitate in loving the stranger with that love to which God has educated Israel by letting them live as strangers in Egypt (10,19). God claims the love of Israel in return for his own (6,5), and fear, so as to avoid tempting him (6,16), and absolute obedience to his commandments, given to Moses on Mount Horeb, but now revealed to the people in Moab. The commandment to love God in Deut. is an important notion in the history of Israel's theology, given almost simultaneously by Hosea and Jeremiah – but cf. already Judg. 5,31.<sup>1)</sup> The most important commandment, following the great commandment to worship Yahweh alone, is the commandment to worship him in one place alone, which he elects as dwelling for his name. According to this idea of *centralisation* of the cultus old regulations are re-edited, and this gives us an important clue to a relative and – combined with 2 Kings 22–23 – an absolute dating of the complex of laws<sup>2)</sup>. As a consequence of centralisation the law introduces the permission to convert the material tithes into money to buy other materials at the central sanctuary (14,24 ff.). The butchering of cattle is made profane (12,15,20 ff.). And even the sacrifice of

<sup>1)</sup> Eichrodt, Theol. d. AT, III, pp. 30ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 13.

the Passover lamb is transferred from the home to the central sanctuary (16,5 ff., cf. Ex. 12,7 (P)).

That the Passover sacrifice must be boiled, not (Ex. 12,9, P) roasted, is probably caused by D's origin in other priestly circles than P.

The claim of centralisation must involve a problem concerning the *support of the priests (Levites) from the sanctuaries now coming out of use*. This problem hides behind the regulations in 18,6 ff., which according to 2 Kings 23,9 were not carried out at the reform in 622. Further the claim of centralisation gives rise to the institution of *refuge towns* (19,1 ff., comp. the earlier passage Ex. 21,1 3 f.,) replacing the old sanctuaries and their altars which had the right of giving asylum to persecuted people. *Lay judges* are introduced instead of the ancient cultic jurisdiction (16,18), while the judicial rights of the *priests* are transferred to the central sanctuary, to which appeal must be made in difficult cases (17,8 ff.). It is a misunderstanding when it is generally asserted that Dt. values "ethics" more than "cultus". It has its ethical ideas like all Israelite-Jewish law. But its main interest is *the right cultus*, concentrated around the only legitimate place of cult. It exalts the *authority of priests* above all other authority, even the king and the prophet, although these authorities also are valued very highly. Its interest in the *Levites* who became unemployed priests through the measure of the centralisation pervades the law (12,19; 14,27, 29; 16,1 1,14; 18,6 ff.). I cannot doubt its origin in these circles: No Jerusalemite priest could write 18,6 ff.: It is proved by 2 Kings. 23,9.<sup>1)</sup>

### *The "Yehovistic" Parts of the Pentateuch.*

When the strata of "priestly" elements, D and P, are separated from the Pentateuch, a bulk of material remains which is of manifestly different character. While D and P have a dominating legal element, the rest mainly consists of *narratives* with only short sections of laws (Ex. 20-24 and Ex. 34).

<sup>1)</sup> Concerning the problem of the origin of the commandment of centralisation, cf. my *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie*, pp. 22 ff., where I also have stated my arguments against the common interpretation of the law as resulting from the preaching of the prophets of the 8-7th centuries, but where I have sought a combination – besides the Levitical fundament – with the earlier, "proto-prophetic" nebiism. A similar conception is maintained by *Hulst*, *Het Karakter van den Cultus in Deuteronomium* (1938). Concerning the theology of Deut. cf. *von Rad*, *Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium* (1929), cf. now also *Deuteronomium-Studien* (1948), p. 48, where he advocates the non-Jerusalemite origin of Deut. – *H. Cazelles*, *Le Deuteronomie* (1950).

Concerning the *dating*, cf. below, pp. 67 ff; on chs. 32-33, p. 40.; on the Decalogue (ch. 5), pp. 52 ff; on the legal material, p. 56.

The Documentary Hypothesis separates this material into two strings of stories, the *Yahwistic* Document (*J*), and the *Elohistic* Document (*E*). There has been some inclination to distinguish at least two sources in *J* (*J*<sup>1</sup> and *J*<sup>2</sup>; *L* and *J* (*Eissfeldt*); *S* and *J* (*Pfeiffer*)), and also to find primary and secondary elements in *E*. But it is often difficult, and even impossible, to sever these strata from one another in a way acceptable to the majority of scholars. In order to stress this circumstance it is customary to use the term “Yehovistic”<sup>1</sup>).

The crucial point of criticism is here the *Elohistic* source. This document was originally found by *Ilgen* in 1798 and rediscovered in 1853 by *Hupfeld*.<sup>2</sup>) The remaining result must be said to be that this material cannot be connected with the source of *P*, formerly called the “First Elohist”, and it is interesting that the separation of *E* and *P* had to take place without using the criterion of the Divine names<sup>3</sup>). The recent opposition against the existence of the Elohist as a separate source<sup>4</sup>) was an attempt to combine most of the Elohistic material with *J* and explain the rest as more or less independent elements, with which *J* was supplemented.

Against this *Humbert*<sup>5</sup>) stressed the argument of the “constants”. The existing *doublets* are linked together through ever recurring constant elements of formal and material nature, even if we are not in all cases able to reconstruct strictly coherent narratives. And the distribution of the Elohistic material in the Yahwistic source leads to intolerable contradictions in the work of the Yahwist, the clear plan of which is praised by *Volz* and *Rudolph*. It is difficult to assume that *J* should have contained so different theological conceptions concerning the invocation of the name of Yahweh as Gen. 4,26 and Ex. 3,13 and 14 b: The story teller of the latter passages cannot have approved of Gen. 4,26 and in general of the “Yahwistic” parts of Genesis and Exodus; if he had been consistent he must have made the name of Yahweh fall more in the background. I cannot accept the slogan “logicism” profusely used by

<sup>1</sup>) after the vocalisation used in the Massoretic text for the tetragrammaton, when it is combined with <sup>14</sup>*donáj*.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. p. 13.

<sup>3</sup>) *Wellhausen* (Prolegomena, 6th ed. p. 8) says: “... der Elohist ist nicht bloß im Stoffe dem Jehovisten nächstverwandt, sondern er ist uns auch nur als ein Ingrediens der jehovistischen Schrift erhalten” (cf. *Nöldeke*, Die sogenannte Grundschrift des Pentateuchs (Untersuchungen zur Kritik des AT, 1869). – *Wellhausen* here uses “Yehovistic” – “Yahwistic”).

<sup>4</sup>) *Rudolph* and *Volz*, cf. above p. 19.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. p. 26. – See also the words of *Albright*, From the Stone Age to Christianity (2nd ed. 1946), p. 190: “The recent effort of *Volz* and *Rudolph*... does not do justice to the homogeneity of these additions”.



the "Uppsala school" as an argument against this. It is also peculiar – but very pleasant for the adherents of the Documentary Hypothesis, or at least of the notion that it contains a great amount of truth – to see that *Rudolph* in his analysis of the Balaam-story frankly admits the validity of the criterion of the changing Divine names<sup>1)</sup> as the Ariadne-thread of the work.

One of the most striking arguments for the separation of E from J has always been the beginning of the *Joseph-story*<sup>2)</sup>. Here the treatment of the problems by *Volz and Rudolph*<sup>3)</sup> is highly artificial.

The problem is the relation between 37,21ff. and 28ff. The current theory is that two parallel narratives have been woven into one another, of which one has *Reuben*, the other *Judah* as the central acting person. One of them tells us that Joseph was *stolen* by *Midianites*, the other that he was *sold* to *Ishmaelites*. When *Rudolph* and others want us to understand this text as a coherent whole, they leave us without explanation of the curious fact that Reuben, who must have been present at the sale (v. 28), afterwards can return to the cistern to draw out Joseph. It is of no significance that *Rudolph* refers to v. 29, for according to what has been told previously, Reuben must know that Joseph was not in the cistern. *Rudolph* wants us to understand v. 28 of a theft committed by the Midianites, not of the carrying out of the plan in v. 27: The subject of the sentence ("they") in v. 28 ("they drew and lifted...") shall be the Midianite merchantmen. According to *Rudolph* the story says: The brothers negotiate with the Ishmaelites about the sale of Joseph. Meanwhile Reuben goes to the pit to draw out Joseph; but in the meantime the Midianites have stolen him, so that the sale cannot be effected. But this would involve that v. 29 had to follow immediately after v. 27, or else the line telling that the Midianites sold the stolen boy to the Ishmaelites (v. 28) should occupy a later place. The narrative is, in the relation of *Volz and Rudolph*, exceedingly clumsy – which contrasts very peculiarly against their constant emphasis on the idea of the artistic cleverness of the Yahwist. It is – in spite of all antagonists of the Documentary Hypothesis – more "natural" to assume two interwoven tales, of which one (v. 28) does not know the proposal of Judah in vv. 26f., but presupposes the stratagem of Reuben from v. 21, countered by the theft of vv. 28–29. That the "recensions" cannot be separated completely throughout the entire chapter, is – as everywhere – no argument against these traces of two narratives, which must have been – in other parts – so highly alike to one another that combination cannot be verified in other parts. To all this must be added that *Rudolph* only by means of much sophism can evade the fact, that the two "motives", the sale and the theft, are mentioned separated from one another later in the narrative, cf. 45,4f. and 40,15.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, ZATW 1939, p. 214.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *De Wette*, Beiträge II, p. 155, on *Ilgen's* treatment of Gen. 37 and 39; and it is worth while to remind readers of the circumstance that *De Wette* does not accept the Documentary Hypothesis. See also the remarks of *Baumgartner* in Theol. Zeitschrift der Theol. Fak. Basel (1947), p. 473 f. B's. concluding remarks might apply to others than the unfortunate *Daneke*.

<sup>3)</sup> *Der Elohist*, p. 153. – cf. now also *North*, The OT and Modern Study, p. 80.

In a similar manner many others of the arguments presented must be regarded, even if it must be admitted that grounds have been given for a less minute separation of "sources" than usual in common literary criticism. That a third stratum is present parallel to the "priestly" ("Aaronitic") material and the J-material seems to me indicated e.g. also in the story of the crossing of the Red Sea (Ex. 14)<sup>1</sup>).

Besides the criterion of *Divine names* there are other *linguistic* particulars separating the J-material from E. The mountain of revelation in J as in P is *Sinai*, in E, *Horeb* (cf. D). The pre-Israelitic population of Canaan is in J called *Canaanites*, in E *Amorites*. The father-in-law of Moses is in J *Reuel* or *Hobab ben-Reuel*, in E *Jether* or *Jethro*.

*Rudolph*<sup>2</sup>) admits this difference between Ex. 3,1; 4,18 and 18, 1 f. on one hand and Num. 10,29 ff. on the other, and concedes that it is difficult to believe that J tolerated a contradiction of this kind in his narrative. He therefore alters *hoten* to *h<sup>a</sup>tan* in the latter passage, but admits that it does not help very much. Accordingly he assumes that *h<sup>a</sup>tan* here signifies "every relative of the wife", "brother-in-law"<sup>3</sup>). This signification is of course possible (cf. 2 Kings 8,27, and Arabic). But in the passage in question the thought that another person than the father in law is meant will not occur to an unprejudiced reader. The evidence of the Massoretes is here very eloquent. *Rudolph's* method is quite arbitrary, and the emendation of Num. 10,29 is only undertaken to evade a further complication of the situation<sup>4</sup>).

Besides the linguistic differences already mentioned a series of other related characteristics in *vocabulary*, *grammar*, and *style* have been noticed – e.g. that E for "female slave" uses the word *'āmāh*, J *šifhāh*; that J prefers verbal suffixes, while E favours the construction of *'eth* with suffixes; that E introduces narratives with *waj<sup>e</sup>hi 'aḥar hadd<sup>e</sup>bārīm hā'elleh*, and tells the beginning of a conversation on the following pattern: "And he cried, "Abraham, Abraham". (note the reiteration of the name!) "And he answered, "I am here!"", or, "I hear!"<sup>5</sup>).

In addition to the linguistic material, critics point to *differences in the stories themselves* of material character. These are to some extent disputed, e.g. the

<sup>1</sup>) cf. my paper *Övergängen over havet*, i *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1938. See also *Wendel*, *OLZ* 1935, cols. 153–6 and *Eissfeldt*, *DLZ* 1934, cols. 1298–1305.

<sup>2</sup>) *Der Elohist von Exod. bis Jos.* p. 63.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Gesenius-Buhl*, *Wörterbuch*, ad. loc.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. *Dillmann's* and *Beer's* commentaries on Ex. 2,18.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. further *Steuernagel*, p. 214 f.

attempts to prove the independence of E and J, and E's North Israelite origin<sup>1</sup>). Against this it is asserted that E is a religious adaptation of J from Judahite circles. *Mowinckel*<sup>2</sup>) has ventilated the theory that E is not at all an independent "author". Its stories of the old days always depend upon the narratives of J, and E is not a single person, but an *oral tradition*, continuing the tradition of the material of J after it had been taken down in writing. The fixed form of the narratives of J has, on the other hand, influenced the development of the legends in later oral tradition, above all J has given to the traditional material a fixed continuous plan and a skeleton to which later ages adhered, so that E is completely dependent upon J concerning the arrangement of the stories. They have accordingly got their form at different times, and the "Elohists", i.e. the last collector, from exilic times, has made his alterations and stamped them with his own language. "E" in this manner becomes the siglum for a whole process, the oral tradition between the J-source in its written form, and the final writing down of the "E"-stories after the fall of the Israelite-Judahite states.

There is no doubt that this view can be supported with good arguments, and especially after the more methodical emphasis given to *oral tradition* in later years, especially by Swedish scholars, it is clear that it contains an important truth. But still I feel inclined to stress that there are narratives of E parallel to those of J which show that *E materially is not entirely dependent upon J*. When e.g. Gen 20, commonly assigned to E, is localised in Gerar, not in Egypt, as in J (Gen. 12); or when the flight, or expulsion, of Hagar in Gen. 16 (J) is said to have taken place before, but in Gen. 21 (E) after, the birth of Ishmael; or when Reuben (E), not Judah (J), in the Joseph story is presented as the leading person among the sons of Jacob, this in my opinion points to more independence on the part of E than *Mowinckel* seems to admit. Similar arguments may be adduced from differences in the Exodus-story<sup>3</sup>). And against his contention that E is Judahite I should point to Ex. 32, the polemic against bull-worship: This can hardly have its origin in Judah, as the example of Hosca proves<sup>4</sup>). I feel more inclined to maintain at least some degree of independence on the part of E and its mainly Northern origin<sup>5</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) The Northern origin of E was especially advocated by *Procksch*, *Das nordhebräische Sagenbuch, Die Elohimquelle* (1906), and is still maintained by *Pfeiffer*, p. 172, although he also assumes Ephraemite material in J (p. 155), while his special idea, the S Document, (roughly = *Eissfeldt's L* and *Smend's J'*, but only found in Gen.) is located in *Edom* (cf. *ZATW* 1930, pp. 66-73).

<sup>2</sup>) *ZATW* 1930, pp. 259ff., 270f.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Steuernagel*, pp. 215ff.

<sup>4</sup>) *Steuernagel*, p. 217f. against *Kuenen*, *Einleitung* § 13,20; cf. my *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie*, p. 16.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 171 (concerning the first) and p. 172 (with regard to the second item).



Many differences seem to indicate that the two strata are independent of one another, even if there is great, and even essential agreement. This is better explained by consideration of the differences, when we assume that the *Northern* and the *Judahite* traditions (E and J) have a common source in the common history of the two parts of the nation, and that the time of union during David and Solomon has caused some assessment of the material. This explains that J retains the Northern traditions such as the local legends of Shechem, Bethel, Mahanaim, Peniel etc.<sup>1)</sup> On the other hand E does not mention the traditions localized in Hebron in Judah, but only the Southernmost sanctuaries with which Northern Israel according to 1 Kings 19,3 ff., Amos 5,5; 8,14 had special connections.

In trying to find differences in *ethico-religious respect* we also are in a difficult position. Both strata contain material of different character and provenience and are none of them strictly literary units. J and E are not merely “authors”, but also “collectors”<sup>2)</sup>. I think that the points of view proposed by *Mowinkel* concerning E in many respects also apply to J, even if there is more of a personality behind the latter stratum. But along with these reservations we nevertheless must stress that both strata have their quite definite, clear cut physiognomy.

There is a distinct *difference in the anthropomorphic description of God*. It is found in both strata, and in both of them there is a tendency to get away from anthropomorphism. But this tendency is most marked in E. In J we meet this *anti-anthropomorphic endeavor* in the description of God as a flame (Gen. 15,17; Ex. 3,2), and in the feature that he is sometimes represented by a “messenger” (Gen. 16,7 ff.; 19,1 ff.; 24,7; Ex. 3,2) or – rarely – that he reveals himself in a dream (Gen. 26,24; 28,13 ff.). Generally J gives us the familiar, in the best sense naïve, stories of God who forms man as a potter makes earthen vessels, blowing life into its nostrils, plants a garden, “builds” woman by means of one of man’s ribs, walks in the garden in the cool of night, eats with Abraham, wrestles with Jacob and Moses, and upon the whole acts on very human motives (Gen. 3,22; 6,6 f.; 8,21; 11,6 ff.). The sublime art – hardly intelligible, if we do not realize that it is rooted in a profound relationship with God and a deep understanding of the reality of sin – reveals itself in the fact that God – in spite of all this, even of the “uncanny”, “primitive”, “demonic” features (Gen. 32,25 ff. and Ex. 4,24) – does not lose anything of his exaltedness, his position as “The Holy One of Israel”. J is a story teller who is able to give a vivid picture of his God without the use of a preacher’s pointer.<sup>3)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> *Steuernagel*, p. 218, cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 172.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. concerning the relations between J and E also *Eissfeldt*, ZATW 1939, p. 235f.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Steuernagel*, p. 219.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 204 and 245f.

Similar anthropomorphic features are found in E, and have not disappeared even in P (Ex. 31,17). In E God dwells on Horeb, here the Elders see him and shares his table (Ex. 24,10<sup>-1</sup>). Moses speaks with him face to face (Ex. 33,11; Num. 12,8), and God writes the laws on the stone tablets with his own hand (Ex. 31,18(?); 32,16; 34,1(?)). But the striving to exalt God from the human world is more pronounced in E. Revelation in relatively "immaterial" phenomena such as fire and cloud plays a far greater part. The pillar of cloud and fire in Ex.-Deut. is perhaps in one passage also found in J (Num. 14,19f.<sup>2</sup>). But above all, revelations through *dreams* are far more used by E than by J, just as the idea of angelic mediatorship is more frequent. With this is probably also connected the notion of Abraham as a prophet (Gen. 20, cf. 15,1).

E seems to be more inimical to *popular religion* than J. The latter contains a prohibition against molten images of God (Ex. 34,17), while E turns sharply against the cult of the *teraphim* (Gen. 35,2; 31,19), the cult of the bull (Ex. 32) and other gods (Jos. 24,2). E acknowledges the *masseboth* (Gen. 28,18; Ex. 24,4), not denounced till the time of D.<sup>3</sup>)

Concerning *ethical* ideas there are also differences to be noted. But again we must realize that the material of both strata comprises much which prevents the building up of a systematically clear code of ethics. Both tell with interest and pleasure several things which were condemned by later ethical thinking – e. g. that Yahweh is made partner in untruthfulness (Ex. 4,23; 5,1ff.; – 3, 21f.; 11,2; 12,35). But this material is subordinated under other conceptions in which the ethical programme of the story-tellers undoubtedly reveals itself – when Yahweh is described as the just judge against sin and unrighteousness (Gen. 19), and as the God who makes Jacob and Joseph's brethren experience the consequences of their sins. We encounter here a parallel to the relation of the idea of God to "primitive" features in the idea of God in J (Gen. 22 and Ex. 4). There is a strong feeling for "things which ought not to be done" (Gen. 34,4). "How can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?" (Gen. 39,9) is an expression of this feeling. We also see ethical consciousness in action against the traditional material, but in a manner showing that E is more sensitive than J. J in two variants allows Abraham and Isaac a lie

<sup>1</sup>) if not J (cf. *Mowinkel* in *Det gamle Testamente oversatt ... I*, p. 163).

<sup>2</sup>) *Steuernagel*.

<sup>3</sup>) E also has preserved the story of *Abraham's* sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22) which gives the *aition* for the permission to substitute an animal for a human sacrifice. – In mentioning this story we must not forget to remind readers of *Kierkegaard's* grand re-telling of the tale in *Frygt og Bæven* (1843) (English ed., *Fear and Trembling* (1939)).



concerning their wives, the later variant in comparison with the first (Gen. 26 comp. Gen. 12) only introducing the feature that the wife suffers no harm, while E attempts to turn the lie into a truth (Gen. 20,12). In E Jacob does not acquire his wealth by clever stratagems (so J, Gen. 30,37ff.), but through the help of God, accounted for by the dishonesty of Laban (Gen. 21,5ff.).

Both strata have in common the *idea of the history of salvation*, characteristic of all strata of the Pentateuch. God carries out his will in spite of the fall of man and the infidelity of Israel, forward towards the fulfilment of the promises to the patriarchs concerning the conquest of the Holy Land. J perhaps has a special share in the development of this programme<sup>1)</sup>. But *Eissfeldt* points out<sup>2)</sup> that in this respect too there is a difference between J and E. While the former places the national and the religious life in a rather natural relation to one another, E lets us hear tones in which religious life rings more strongly. The separation of Israel from other nations is more marked (Ex. 19,5-6; Num. 23,9,21). And the possibility of the Divine rejection of the people is expressed in the descriptions of the defection of Israel in the wilderness.

Besides *literature* quoted in the notes concerning the problem of the existence of the Elohist, see also *Eissfeldt*, *Theologische Blätter* 1939, cols. 224-233, and *Die Komposition der Bileam-Erzählung*, ZATW 1939, pp. 212-241. *Albright*, *The oracles of Balaam*, JBL 1944, pp. 207ff. - *Albright*, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1946), p. 190.

A special problem was presented to literary criticism by the difficulty to determine the *beginning of the source E*. Definite traces were supposed not to appear until Gen. 20, where the word *missām* in v. 1 makes good that this ch. cannot be the beginning of the source. Very frequently critics have supposed E to be present in one of the threads assumed in Gen. 15. Critics have reached a large amount of agreement in a hypothetical separation of the strata, as the results e.g. in *Kautzsch*, 4th ed. and the Norwegian translation by *Michelet*, *Mowinckel* and *Messel* show concerning this chapter. But if E is present in v. 1 this place cannot be the beginning of it. It must have contained a narrative of the emigration of Abraham (cf. Jos. 24,2, commonly assigned to E). *Mowinckel*<sup>3)</sup> has attempted to prove that one of two J-strata generally assumed in the primeval story is E.

Conc. Gen. 10 (JE-material), cf. *Albright*, *Stone Age*, p. 191; *Gustav Hölscher*, *Drei Erdkarten* (Sitzungsber. d. Heidelberger Akademie, Phil-Hist. Kl., 1944-48) (1949).

<sup>1)</sup> cf. below, pp. 74 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> pp. 224 ff.

<sup>3)</sup> The two sources of the pre-deuteronomiac primeval history (JE) in Gen. 1-11 (1937), cf. the discussion between *Mowinckel* and *Albright* in JBL 1939, pp. 87-103. - A very valuable discussion of the same question is found in *Humbert*, *Études sur le récit du paradis et la Chute dans la Genèse* (1940), cf. *Mowinckel's* review in *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* (1947), p. 249f. - Concerning the question, Was Adam created as mortal? answered by a "No" by *Humbert*, cf. also my article "Syndens sold er døden", *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* (1945, pp. 65 ff.



## The legal Material of JE.

*The Decalogue.*

The "Ten Commandments" are found, in two different forms, in Ex. 20,1-17 and Dt. 5,6-21. The oldest manuscript witness to the text is the *Papyrus Nash* (ca. 100 A.D.)<sup>1)</sup>. In both passages the partition into verses and the accentuation is double<sup>2)</sup>. One of the two accentuations is used for public reading in the synagogue, the other for private reading and study<sup>3)</sup>. It is ancient tradition that there are "ten words" in this collection, cf. Dt. 4,12; 10,4. This arrangement is found in different ways in different traditions: A) *Philo*, *Josephus*, the *Church of Antiquity*, the *Reformed Churches* under *Calvinistic* influence, the *Socinians*, and the *Greek Orthodox Church* count the commandments in the following way: 1) Prohibition of the worship of foreign gods; 2: Prohibition of images; 3: Prohibition of abuse of the name of God; 4: the Sabbath; 5: parents; 6: adultery; 7: murder; 8: theft; 9: false oath; 10: covetousness. 6 and 7 however are generally given in the usual order of the Hebrew text.<sup>4)</sup> That the order of these two commandments has not been fixed is also seen in Mk. 10,19; Lk. 18,20. B) *St. Augustine*, the *Roman Church* and *Luther* take nos. 1 and 2 as one commandment, while no. 10 is divided into two. Further, the prohibitions against adultery and murder are inverted, giving us the following arrangement: 1: Against idolatry; 2: of the name of God; 3: the Sabbath; 4: the parents; 5: murder; 6: adultery; 7: theft; 8: false oath; 9: the house of the neighbour; 10: the property of the neighbour. C) *Modern Jews* take the introductory words "I am the Lord thy God. . . ." as the first "word", combine prohibition of idolatry and image-worship as under B, and do not divide the prohibition of covetousness.

The division as under A) is materially the best, but also C) is good, while the division of the last commandment in B) is rather artificial<sup>5)</sup>.

The two forms of the Decalogue are not quite alike. The motivation of the commandment concerning the *Sabbath* is more elaborate in Dt. than in Ex., and the same is the case in the commandment to *honour the parents*. In

<sup>1)</sup> According to *Albright*, JBL 1937, pp. 145ff. the *script* of the Nash papyrus should indicate that it dates from the Maccabaeian age, cf. also *Bowman* in Willoughby, *The Study of the Bible to-day and to-morrow* (1947), p. 4. — But when *Albright* considers the newly found Isaiah-scroll more ancient than the papyrus Nash, and dates the new manuscript to ca. 100 B.C., the papyrus Nash must be *later* than 100 B.C. (cf. *The Biblical Archaeologist*, 1948, p. 55; *P. Kahle* in the *Bertholet-Festschrift* (1949), and in the *Nötscher-Festschrift* (1950), pp. 129ff.; cf. *Die hebr. Handschriften aus der Höhle*, pp. 5ff. 22. — On the *pap. Nash*, see also *Lacheman*, *Jew. Qu. Rev.* 1949, pp. 15ff. — Cf. *Appendix*.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. GK § 15 p.

<sup>3)</sup> *Hertz*, *Pentateuch and Haftorahs II* (1930), p. 209.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. also *Book of Common Prayer*.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. *Beer*, *Exodus*, ad. loc.; *Hertz*, *op. cit.*, pp. 210ff.

the prohibition against *false oath* the two recensions use two different words for "false". In the prohibition of covetousness Dt. places the wife before the house, against Ex. LXX seems to assess the two forms. The commandment of the Sabbath has also a difference in the commandment itself, Dt. saying "Keep" (*šāmōr*), Ex. "Remember" (*zākōr*).

So different recensions cannot both be original. But the great similarities prove the existence of a *common original form*. This original form can presumably be reached by reducing the two extant forms. Generally it is assumed that the motivations are later developments, the original commandments having been quite short, lapidary, as in our catechisms.

The two present forms can be *dated* with some certainty. Ex. 20,11 shows dependence on Gen. 2,3, coming from P. Presumably the form of Ex. therefore has been arranged under the influence of this stratum. As P like D considers the Decalogue the law of the two tablets (Ex. 25,16 etc.), we may conclude that it must have occupied a central place in the Sinai-narrative of Pg as in that of D. Its original place is however uncertain. The present place in Ex. 20 is not very probable, the Decalogue being surrounded by JE-material. The trace of P in Ex. 20,11 makes it probable that a RP has placed it there<sup>1)</sup>. The original place may be somewhere in a P-context (25,1ff.), perhaps just after P's introduction to the Sinai-revelation, Ex. 15-18. A similar place is occupied by the deuteronomistic form in Dt. 5.

It is most probable that the original Decalogue is older than the oldest of the two contexts of D and P, these two belonging to exilic and post exilic times in their present shape. That it is older than D seems to follow from the fact that its teaching on retribution (Ex. 20,5-7; Dt. 5,9-10) does not agree with the view of this problem set forth in deuteronomism.<sup>2)</sup> The problem is whether the Yehovistic stratum has contained the Decalogue. But nothing can as yet be known concerning this matter. As Ex. 34 cannot with certainty be determined as a decalogue, we are not justified in saying that the presence in J of this chapter excludes the connection of our Decalogue with this stratum. And still less can it be maintained that Ex. 21ff. excludes it from E. But with some certainty it may be presumed that J and E cannot have contained *two* collections of laws, both beginning with the prohibition of foreign gods and images. Ex. 20,3-4 is parallel to 20,23, (cf. 23,13b (E)) and also to 34,14 and 17 (J). 34,21 and 23,12 also contain a Sabbath-commandment, giving a clumsy repetition, if J and E should have contained both the Decalogue and the other laws, cf. also 20,16 and 23,1a.

<sup>1)</sup> Steuernagel, p. 154; Pfeiffer, p. 228f. Mowinkel, Det gamle testamente oversatt.. ad. loc.

<sup>2)</sup> Jacobsen, Gammetestamentlig Kritik i Religionsundervisningen (1934), p. 35.

Accordingly it is not possible to argue from the earlier strata in trying to date the Decalogue. But even if they have not contained it, it is not therefore certain that it did not exist. On the base of the supposedly strong ethical element of the Decalogue it is generally assumed to be a result of the preaching of the prophets of the 8-7 th centuries. But its interest in cultic matters (prohibition of images and the commandment on the Sabbath) is not so restricted that it may be considered an expression of the ideals of the prophetic circles. Its morals – when they are not taken in the sense of the Sermon on the Mount and Luther's catechisms – are expressions of common Israelite morals and may therefore well be earlier than the "cult-polemical" prophets of the 8-7th century. The prohibition "to covet" is extremely intelligible in a "primitive" culture. "To covet" means to be desirous of something and to try to bring it into one's own possession<sup>1</sup>). – The prohibition of images is found both in J and E, and therefore this commandment cannot be quoted as argument for a later date of the Decalogue, especially if the laws of Ex. 20,23 and 34,17 should be older than J and taken over by this stratum. The difficulty is that the earliest time after the immigration seems to have known image-worship without taking offence at it as treason to true Yahwism. Teraphim were found in the house of David (1 Sam. 19,13), being of a shape that could be mistaken for a human being. More uncertain is the narrative Judg. 17f.<sup>2</sup>) – Another difficulty is the mentioning of the ox in the 10th commandment. This animal can hardly have been in the possession of Israelite nomads during the Mosaic age. But the whole enumeration of items of property, including the ox, is probably not part of the original commandment, which was only a short prohibition of covetousness, (the 9th commandment in the form of Ex.). And also the prohibition of images may belong to the later enlargements. It is possible to find "10 words" in the Decalogue without this commandment<sup>3</sup>). Besides it is possible that image-worship in the time of David was something belonging to the women who were not

<sup>1</sup>) cf. Herrmann, in Sellin-Festschrift (1927), pp. 71 ff., and my article, (Dansk) Teologisk Tidsskrift 1924, p. 321; my Indledning til de gammeltestamentlige Salmer (1932), pp. 114 ff.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. also the importance of archaeological evidence stressed by G. E. Wright in The Study of the Bible today and tomorrow, ed. Willoughby, p. 93; "Though statues of male deities are frequently found in Canaanite sites, not a single clear example has thus far been found within the thousand tons of débris removed from Israelite sites. The evidence in this case is so striking that it cannot be discussed as a questionable argument from silence. On the other hand the female figurines are numerous, but syncretism has obviously not displaced Yahweh as national God".

<sup>3</sup>) cf. above, p. 52 C.



admitted to the legitimate Israelite cultus, to which primarily the men had access. Finally it is a possibility (cf. Ex. 20,23) that originally not all images, but only certain sorts of idols, of especially costly material, were forbidden.<sup>1)</sup>

All this only means that *we can establish a possibility that the Decalogue may be Mosaic*. But we cannot get from *posse* to *esse*. This does not mean that the Decalogue is not Mosaic. There is possibility, but not more. The two extant forms carry us back into late pre-exilic times, but single elements of the collection seem to go back to more ancient times. And the commandment to worship Yahweh alone is surely rooted through tradition in the Mosaic foundation of religion, so that it would be quite foolish to deny this connection with Moses.

What may further be said of the Decalogue has been mentioned in our treatment of the forms of literature<sup>2)</sup>. To sum up, we must notice that *we cannot reckon the Decalogue to the legal corpora taken over by JE*. Its position in Ex. 20 in a JE-context is probably due to the work of a RP just as its position in Dt. 5 is due to a deuteronomist. In both contexts the motivations are mainly deuteronomistic. This seems to indicate that it has got its central position through this school. *It is from the time of deuteronomism that it is described as the laws inscribed on the stone tablets in the Ark of the Covenant*. This does not indicate antiquity. But if, on the other hand, the Decalogue represents an old ritual formula, the possibility of old age again increases – but again: not more than possibility.<sup>2a)</sup>

### *The Book of the Covenant.*

This name for the law-complex in Ex. 20,22–23,33 is taken from Ex. 24,7, cf. 24,3, which proves that the “commandments” here mentioned are not the Decalogue. The Book of the Covenant seems to be the basis of the covenant between Israel and Yahweh according to E.

But this complex is no unity. This is evident from the meaningless doublets (e.g. 20,23 and 23,13b) and from different superscriptions inside the complex (20,22a; 21,1; 23,13a). But above all critics point to the different forms of the regulations. We have a great bulk of material of *casuistic form*, from which some regulations distinguish themselves by their *apodeictic form*<sup>3)</sup>. Further, some passages show signs of origin from priestly, both deuteronomistic and Aaronitic, hands. Accordingly, therefore, the complex is no original “law-book”, but a later construction based on older collections, of which

<sup>1)</sup> cf. below, p. 56. <sup>2)</sup> I, p. 221ff. – <sup>2a)</sup> cf. Rowley, *Moses and the Decalogue* (1951) (Bull. of the J. Rylands Lib.); also in French, *Rev. de l'hist. et de la philos. rel.* (1952).

<sup>3)</sup> cf. I, pp. 224ff.

the casuistic rules and the apodeictic commandments have formed originally independent parts. The different styles perhaps refer to different sociological contexts<sup>1</sup>).

The analysis of the complex being so disputed it is intelligible that the *dating* is uncertain too. Setting aside the distinct deuteronomistic and Aaronitic supplements it is however evident that the *cultural background* of the regulations gives some indications. It is apparent that not the time of Moses, the "wanderings in the wilderness" or the nomadic age, is the background. The *ox* is mentioned as a common animal in the property of the Israelites. This refers the laws to the same cultural stage as the other Oriental laws, Hammurapi's laws, the old Assyrian laws, the Sumerian and Hittite codes, the milieu of the city-states of Palestine<sup>1a</sup>). *Horses* are not mentioned, on the other hand. Whether kingship is known in 22,27 is disputed (cf. 1 Kings. 11,34 and LXX on Gen. 23,6<sup>2</sup>). The expression is too familiar to be decisive. The *cultic* regulations refer to a rather ancient age. The altar must be made of earth or unhewn stones – different from passages as early as 1 Kings 1,50f.; 2,28<sup>3</sup>). There is no claim of cultic centralisation, and no absolute prohibition of images, the commandment concerning monolatry (20,23) only containing prohibition against images of costly metals, perhaps an evidence of reaction from the nomadic ideal against the refinements of Palestinian culture. An ancient feature is also found in 22,28, where the commandment of the sacrifice of the male firstborn seems to be maintained without the limitations of 34,20.

These features seem to indicate a *relatively early age* for the law as *Israelite* code. As such it probably dates from the time at the *beginning of the age of the monarchy*. Dt. to a great extent contains the same legal material, but adapts it in another way. It has been taken over by E, where it has been provided with a subscription (23,20ff.), placing it in the Sinai pericope.

Perhaps E has only contained the apodeictic, imperative commanding parts (20,23–26; 22,28–29; 23,1–19). This would explain the curious new superscription in 21,1 and other things<sup>4</sup>): The casuistic parts should then have been "wedged into" E by later elohistic hand or by R<sup>JE</sup> or R<sup>D</sup>. But we can hardly determine this matter for certain.

H. Cazelles, *Études sur le Code de l'Alliance* (1946).

<sup>1</sup>) I, p. 226. Concerning the relations to the laws of the Ancient Orient we refer to the commentaries, e.g. *Beer's* pp. 121–125, cf. also I, pp. 216ff. – <sup>1a</sup>) When *Albright* (*The OT and Modern Study*, p. 39, stresses its background in the Bronze-Age, this means that the basis of ancient Oriental legislation has been laid in this time, its material living still in Israelite law, taken over from Israel's environment (cf. I, p. 219). Cf. Appendix.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Beer*. <sup>3</sup>) cf. *Beer*. <sup>4</sup>) *Mowinkel*, *Det gamle Testamente oversatt*, I, op. 151ff.

*Ex. 34.*

In the present context of Exodus ch. 34 deals with the renewal of the covenant after the defection of the people (the calf-worship, ch. 32). According to common opinion this is not original. In that case the contents of the restored tablets of the law would not be the collection of regulations in Ex. 34, which in spite of many parallels is not identical with Ex. 20ff. Either we should have a repetition of these laws, or it would only be related that they were written anew. Therefore it is probable that all hints at a renewal of the covenant (in the verses 1,4,9,28) are secondary attempts to combine originally parallel collections. The same is manifestly true of the familiar deuteronomistic phrases of vv. 11-13 and 24. If RP<sup>1)</sup> is responsible for the place of the Decalogue in ch. 20 it is probably also RP who has added the allusions to it in 34,28<sup>2)</sup>. What remains is considered a parallel to the Book of the Covenant of E and to E's description of the conclusion of the covenant. Ex. 34 is assumed to belong to the Sinai-section of J, pointing back to 19,20-22,25; 24,1 (÷ additions of RJE) - 2,9 (÷ additions of the same hands) 11. J probably must have had the episode of the golden calf after 34, if it has known it all.

The code of Ex. 34,15ff. contains 13 commandments. It is widely supposed that originally it was a decalogue. But critics differ very much concerning the separation of the commandments, so that the assumption of a decalogue is rather uncertain, even if it is not very probable that 13 is the original number. But there may as well be 12 as 10. The commandments are all in imperative, apodeictic form. The age of the document is much the same as that of the Book of the Covenant.

The present arrangement of the text, according to which Ex. 34 describes a renewal of the covenant, is presupposed by Dt. 10,1ff. and is therefore pre-deuteronomistic. The most probable assumption must be that it is a work of RJE, which is also the common idea among critics. But as mentioned above there are also deuteronomistic elements in Ex. 34, pointing to a revision under the aegis of this school.<sup>3)</sup>

Gen. 49 and Deut. 33.

The poetical pieces of the Pentateuch have been treated together with the forms of literature<sup>4)</sup>. Here we only make some remarks concerning their

<sup>1)</sup>cf. pp. 53 and 55.

<sup>2)</sup> Goethe's assumption, based on this verse, that Ex. 34 is the original Decalogue of the stone-tablets (Zwo wichtige biblische Fragen (1783)), has been anticipated by a Greek theologian (Nestle, ZATW 1904, p. 134f.).

<sup>3)</sup> cf. the detailed treatment of Pfeiffer, pp. 221 ff.

<sup>4)</sup> I, pp. 141 ff.



present form to give an impression of their presumable time of origin as literary products.

They have been combined from probably originally independent pieces, and the dating of the separate parts, as far as it is possible, therefore gives an indication of a dating of the whole, which must be later than the latest section.

Important are the *connections with legends in J*, exhibited by the Reuben-, Simeon-, and Levi-strophe of Gen. 49. There are lines of communication to Gen. 35,22 and Gen. 34, not easily disentangled. As in other cases (Judg. 4 and 5; Ps. 132 and the stories of the Ark in Sam.) we presumably have to deal with a poetical tradition and a relatively independent prose narrative concerning the same subjects. On this basis nothing concerning a dating can be said. The curse resting on Reuben certainly means that the significance of the tribe, being still comparatively prominent in Judg. 5,15f., has been strongly reduced. This means that we are far from the time of the immigration. Similarly we must think concerning the Simeon-Levi verse. The Joseph-strophe may allude to the incursions of nomadic enemies in the time of the Judges (Judg. 6-8), and the Judah-strophe can best be understood as an allusion to the great period of the Davidic dynasty. That Joseph is treated on nearly the same level also points to the time of union under David and Solomon. This therefore gives the most probable starting point for a dating of the whole.

Dt. 33 is set in a poetical frame, placing the blessings inside a hymnic description of the national God. It is a "liturgy"<sup>1)</sup>. Here it is interesting that the two tribes, Reuben and Judah, are described as being in trouble. V. 7 may be understood as a description of the situation during the time of the Judges, when Judah seems to have been separated from the rest of the amphictyony, but also as an allusion to the time after the disruption of the Davidic kingdom. The first possibility can hardly be kept up, because Judg. 5 reveals such a lack of interest in Judah (the tribe is not mentioned at all), that the wish expressed that Judah may return to his people does not seem justified<sup>2)</sup>. It is therefore more appropriate to accept the other date, which must give us the valuable information that the words come from the Northern kingdom. This leads to the assumption that the whole composition originated there. It is accordingly later than Gen. 49. This is corroborated by Simeon's complete disappearance<sup>3)</sup>. While the situation of Dan is not quite clear in Gen. 49, it is obvious that Dt. 33 presupposes that the migration of this tribe to the country at the

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 143 and 159ff. – On the first verses, see Nyberg, ZDMG 1938, pp. 320ff.

<sup>2)</sup> Mowinkel, *Det gamle Testamente oversatt...* I, p. 422.

<sup>3)</sup> The position of *Benjamin* (v. 12) is disputed (Mowinkel, *op. cit.* ad loc.).

sources of the Jordan has taken place (Judg. 17ff.). The most important difference of Dt. 33 over against Gen. 49 is the Levi-strophe. Dt. 33 here does not speak of curse and dispersion, but of the predominant place of the priestly tribe (v. 11). This verse probably carries us into a time when the Levites are fighting for their priestly monopoly against kings, sheikhs and heads of families. Judg. 17 shows us an earlier stage of the position of Levites. It is not certain whether v. 20 refers to the sufferings of Gad under the Moabite king *Mesha* referred to in his inscription on the Moabite stone, but it cannot be called impossible. This would carry us down into the time of Jeroboam II in the 8th century, which also corresponds to the description given by v. 18-19 and Amos of the condition of prosperity in the Northern kingdom in those days.

The two chapters may belong each to one of the Yehovistic strata<sup>1)</sup>, like Dt. 32 to D.<sup>2)</sup>.

### MATERIAL OUTSIDE THE STRATA

Just as it is not possible to disentangle the strata completely from one another and combine them to complete coherent "documents", there will also in the Pentateuch be material which cannot with certainty be subordinated under any of the greater strata. We can e.g. point to the fact that the *law-material* not only in Ph, P<sup>o</sup>, Pg, but also in D and JE to a great extent is material which was collected and combined into its present forms before being taken over by the story tellers incorporating it in their "Sinai-pericopes", e.g. the Decalogue, Book of the Covenant, Ex. 34, and much corresponding material in D. Further, many of the *poems* (blessings, curses and other songs) are often originally independent material. It has also been noted long ago that the greater part of the narrative material of the strata already before the writing down had attained a certain fixed form in oral tradition, not only as the primitive single units, the legends, but also as *cycles of legends*, which had approached one another, forming larger complexes<sup>3)</sup>. These formations lived on in oral tradition even after the fixing in writing<sup>4)</sup>. As examples of such cycles may be mentioned the legends grouped around the patriarchs, or the seer Balaam, and the traditions of the conquest of the Holy Land.

Among the sections which are not to be subordinated to the greater strata *Gen. 14* occupies a prominent place. It stands like an erratic block in the stories of Abraham, distinguished from them by its warlike character. In

<sup>1)</sup> Mowinkel, op. cit. ad loc.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. above p. 40. and I, pp. 160 and 208 f.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*; Gressmann, *Mose und seine Zeit* (1914).

<sup>4)</sup> Mowinkel's analysis of the Balaam-saga, quoted above, p. 48, n. 2.

spite of single words reminiscent of the idiom of P (r<sup>e</sup>kuš, j<sup>e</sup>līdē bajit, nefēš) it is clear that its manner of relating is quite different from that of P. And while "Mamre" in Gen. 14 is a personal name, it is in P a place name. These matters are best explained on the assumption that the story is later than and partly influenced by its usage. And this is affirmed through the probability that it presupposes all the strata<sup>1)</sup>. It cannot be understood without the stories of Lot and Abraham (Gen. 12,6-8+13,2,5,7,-11a, 12b-13) and Sodom (Gen. 18-19). This theory which must carry the tale down into a late post-exilic age is also favoured by the circumstance that the number of Abraham's warriors (318) probably is a result of a gematria-operation based on the name of Eliezer (Gen. 15,2). Over against this it is of no importance that the storyteller worked with interesting traditional material of names and events. The story in its present form accordingly becomes a phenomenon parallel to the Daniel-legends and Judith.<sup>2)</sup> But traces of older material may give us hints of tendencies in the policy of David<sup>3)</sup>.

#### THE END OF THE DOCUMENTARY HYPOTHESIS?

The preceding pages have shown that there is widespread distrust in the Documentary Hypothesis. Especially the very strong stressing of the importance of *oral tradition* has led into this situation. Significant is the position of *Mowinkel* in the question concerning the stratum E. In some quarters<sup>4)</sup> we also meet a strong tendency to separate Gen. from Ex.-Num. as originally different complexes of tradition. *Pedersen*<sup>5)</sup> places the Passover legend in the middle of the whole Pentateuchal complex in a way which justifies that he calls it "the second primeval story". And *Galling*<sup>6)</sup> also stresses the difference between the patriarchal traditions and those centred round Moses.

But on the other hand, *Engnell* underlines the continuity of the Pentateuch, as it is accentuated by *von Rad* in his pointing out of the connection between the promises to the Patriarchs and their fulfilment in the landnama-story.<sup>7)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 239.

<sup>2)</sup> *Pfeiffer* (p. 160f.) assigns the Melchizedek episode (vv. 18-20) to a late date, but together with the rest of the chapter he arranges the material in his S-document, vv. 18-20 in S<sup>2</sup>, the rest in S<sup>1</sup>. - The identification of "Amraphel king of Shinar" (v. 1) with Hammurapi has now been generally abandoned (*Finegan*, *Light from the Ancient Past*, p. 60, n. 36).

<sup>3)</sup> *Nyberg*, *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*, I, col. 10; *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 1938, pp. 357ff.

<sup>4)</sup> e.g. *Engnell*, pp. 213ff., referring to *Pedersen*, *Kaufmann*, *Coppens*.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. the quotations of *Engnell*, p.218, n. 2: *ZATW* 1934, p. 161f. and *Israel III-IV*, pp. 393ff.

<sup>6)</sup> *Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels* (1928).

<sup>7)</sup> *Engnell*, p. 217. - Conc. "landnama", cf. p. 74.



And in consequence of this I think that some of the symptoms to which attention was drawn in the previous chapter nevertheless indicate that there are *differences of opinions and of styles* etc. pointing to different strata inside the older, "pre-P" material of the Pentateuch, and that these strata have qualities making them stand out over against one another. This leads to the assumption that there is some truth in the old literary hypothesis to be preserved under new conditions. And other symptoms may be added.

First we should point to the too easily dismissed *analogy of the Diatessaron of Tatian*.<sup>1)</sup> It is an Oriental analogy, and *Engnell* does not tell us, why this work must be said to come from a quite different literary situation. And the example of the relations between *Chron.* and *Kings* offers at least a genuine Eastern parallel not too far from the time of the Pentateuch. The same is true of the relations between *Chron.* and the "sources", the "memoirs" of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, and of the book of *Jeremiah*<sup>2)</sup>.

Another symptom not to be dismissed is the fact that there are manifestly *two creation stories* in *Genesis*, the P-story of ch. 1 and the story commonly assigned to J in chs. 2-3. This seems to indicate that there are two strands, each beginning with a myth of the New Year Festival. And I must confess that I do not understand how it is possible to come through the Story of the Flood without assuming some sort of stratification. Taken together, the Creation and the Flood stories seem to me to prove that there is more than one "last tradent" ("P") in *Gen.* And the P-material continues to stand beside material also in *Ex.* where we have two definitely different stories of the call of *Moses*, both of them by "constants" connected with material of *Gen.*<sup>3)</sup>

We have, however, to give up the *Documentary Hypothesis* in its purely literary form. We must refrain from the minute separation of "documents", cutting out verses, half-verses, and single words in order to establish a complete disentanglement of "books inside the books", as it is done e.g. in the *Polychrome Bible*. – And concerning the *dates* of the "sources" we must remember that they only refer to a certain point in the history of the literary complex in question. We must pay attention to the claim of *Engnell*,<sup>4)</sup> that we have to distinguish between the *material* and the literary *form*. The material, e.g.

<sup>1)</sup> *Engnell*, p. 208f. against *Hammershaimb*, *Haandbog i Kristendomskundskab* II, p. 186.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 245ff., and *Mowinkel*, *Prophecy and Tradition*, pp. 20ff.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. p. 25 and 28. – On *Gen.* 1ff. cf. *Ringgren*, in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1948, p. 13.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Wellhausen*, *Prolegomena*, pp. 314ff., cf. pp. 53, 346, 364, cf. p. 421. This is only one example of the degree to which "anti-Wellhausenianism" stands in often unacknowledged debt to the great scholar *Wellhausen*, cf. the same words of *Bowman*, in *The Study of the Bible today and tomorrow*, ed. *Willoughby*, pp. 12ff., cf. also the articles of *Baumgartner* and *Irwin*, mentioned *ibid.*, p. 13, n. 44.

the individual story, the individual poem, the legal sentence and smaller legal units and units of middle size<sup>1)</sup>, is generally old and most of it is pre-exilic. But the greater complexes, the strata, are only in part pre-exilic. We have just pointed out that there must be a strong element of truth in the theory of "pre-P" collections of material, mainly identical with the mass of stories assigned to J by the older school. And we feel strongly inclined to follow *Mowinkel* in his assumption that there is some *E-material* between the two strata J and P, material which however has not been so markedly collected into a special compilation, but which rather represents later accretions on J. Especially the E-material may contain evidence of being worked upon in post-exilic days. Greater complexes, like the Deuteronomic Law, the Code of Holiness, and P too, have had their foundations laid in late pre-exilic times.

But even on this new basis, where we prefer to speak of "*strata*" or "*strands*" instead of "documents", we cannot give up the attempt to distinguish the "*schools*" behind the strata or "groups of tradition". In my opinion *Engnell* and his followers have stopped investigation too early<sup>2)</sup>. The same seems to hold good of *Pedersen*.<sup>3)</sup> There are too many indications forcing us not to stop so early. Even in the case of the Passover legend, Ex. 1-15, so brilliantly explained by *Pedersen*, it is admitted that it bears the mark of conditions both of the monarchical period and of post-exilic times, and that there are internal incongruities and irregularities in it. These latter are explained as additions and alterations, having got in in the course of times. But this cannot explain the coherence in opinion and style between the different elements, expressed in the argument of *Humbert's* "*constants*" especially the marked difference concerning the divine names of Ex. 3 and 6, corresponding to elements apparent in Gen. 4 and 17. It is also clear that Ex. 12 contains distinct deuteronomistic elements. There is some sort of stratification which we have to explore as far as possible, and here the criteria of the Documentary Hypothesis may still be used, of course with care and caution. *Engnell* and others seem to end in some sort of Supplementary Hypothesis<sup>4)</sup>. But is it not likely that history in this case will repeat itself? Just as this theory under the conditions of purely literary criticism was supplanted by the New Documentary Theory, so the modern parallel will – presumably – have the same fate in the age dominated by the insight into oral tradition. And perhaps we shall have

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 252ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 246, n. 1.

<sup>3)</sup> *Pedersen*, *Israel III-IV*, p. 731.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. above pp. 19ff. – But see also *North*, in *The OT and Modern Study*, pp. 78f.

to accept a hypothesis which combines this new theory with a greater acknowledgement of the truth of the Supplementary Theory.<sup>1)</sup>

Finally: The written stories represent the final result of a long oral tradition. The task is now to grasp the *oral prehistory* of the material. But this does not stand in an exclusively alternative relation to literary criticism, even if history of tradition must often call literary criticism back to its proper limitations, maintaining as the fundamental work the investigation of the single traditions given to us by the texts. But at a certain point this tradition has become "literature", which as such must be handled by means of literary methods, the old methods of literary criticism.<sup>2)</sup> The slogan "oral tradition" must not become a sort of smoke-screen blacking out the problems of the text<sup>3)</sup>. ZATW 1931 p.174 f. *Pedersen* writes: "Die Betrachtung der israelitischen literarischen Quellen, welche seit der Mitte des XIX. Jhs. geltend gemacht worden ist, ist von der modernen Geschichtsforschung übernommen. Sie setzt voraus, dass jedes Dokument zeitlich genau fixiert und sein Wert als Quelle genau abgegrenzt werden kann. Diese quellenkritische Methode hat ihre unzweifelhafte Bedeutung auch für das Altertum, wenn es sich darum handelt Begebenheiten und Tatsachen festzustellen; aber sie muss stark begrenzt werden, wenn es gilt, die Kultur eines Volkes zu beschreiben". P. 179 he continues: "Alle Quellen des Pentateuchs sind sowohl vorexilisch wie nachexilisch. Wenn wir mit ihnen.... arbeiten, haben wir keinen anderen Weg als den der inneren Schätzung". This distinction between History of Events and History of Culture must certainly be kept in mind. For the first of them the fixation of the greater and greatest complexes ("strata" etc.) is of major importance and cannot be left aside, but must be taken seriously.

Having thus stated the arguments for the stratification or at least for the *hypothesis of stratification* we therefore proceed to develop the theories concerning the dating of the strata.

### THE AGE OF THE "SOURCES"

During the earlier phases of literary criticism P, under the name of the "Grundschrift", was generally supposed to be the most ancient document. It is this situation which was reversed by the *Graf* hypothesis as it was expounded and accounted for especially through the famous Prolegomena of *Wellhausen*.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. the words of *Irwin*, quoted by *Bowman*, in *The Study of the Bible*.. ed *Willoughby* p. 14. - See the *Appendix*.

<sup>2)</sup> *Mowinkel*, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1947, p. 221 f.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. also *Mowinkel*, *Prophecy and Tradition*, pp. 84 ff



In trying to determine the age of the documents it is generally attempted to fix a *relative chronology*, the relations of the strata to one another in time, without engaging oneself in the problems of *absolute chronology*, i.e. the dating of the strata to definite years or centuries.

In both phases of the work, however, it is necessary to keep in mind, that we can only attain a *very approximate dating* of the strata. It mostly affects the main stem of the stratum. We must take into account the fact that the circles to which the strata belong have worked upon them and supplemented them again and again. It must be underlined that the standing question "pre-Exilic or post-Exilic" is not an absolute "either-or". All the strata contain both pre-Exilic and post-Exilic material. *They are as much parallel as successive*. It is no novelty that P contains very ancient material. This was stressed many times even by *Wellhausen*; a fact often forgotten by modern authors<sup>1</sup>). And in the Yehovistic material there is at least one passage which is generally assigned to later times, viz. Gen. 18,22b-33<sup>2</sup>).

*Wellhausen's* argument for his conception of the relative age of the sources has its centre of gravity in an investigation of the Old Testament *history of the cult*. In detail he points out how the sanctuary, the sacrificial system, the cultic personnel, etc. have a history, only historically intelligible if D and P, in this succession, stand at the final point of the development, not at its beginning. The argument is based upon the indisputable fact that the historical books describe a cultus in many respects different from that described by the "law", above all in the question of the *cultic centralisation*, which is not known to the Yehovistic strata and to the books of Judges and Samuel, but comes to the front in the book of Kings in its deuteronomistic framework as critical norm of the judgment passed on the kings. Here the centralisation, as in Dt. itself, is a commandment, a claim, fighting for existence, while in P it is not only the *tacit presupposition*<sup>3</sup>). In like manner the history of sacrifice and festivals and priesthood can be examined.

<sup>1</sup>) *Wellhausen*, Prolegomena, 6th ed., pp. 346, 364, cf. 421.

<sup>2</sup>) But cf. *Eichrodt*, Theol. d. AT III, p. 110, n. 10.

<sup>3</sup>) When *Enignell*, Gamla testamentet I, pp. 222ff., following *Kaufmann*, ZATW 1930, pp. 32ff., denies that P knows this idea, he seems to forget that he (p. 205) has made some critical remarks against the separation of P<sup>h</sup> from P. I am quite at one with him in counting P<sup>h</sup> to the P-material. But I cannot interpret Lev. 17 (Ph) without understanding it as a plea for centralisation. When "P proper", therefore, has taken up Ph, this must mean that P acknowledges the commandment of centralisation, embodied in this older work of his own "school". - The passages quoted by *Kaufmann* to prove that P (proper) presupposes that every town may have its own *bāmah*, are for the most part misinterpreted (ZATW, p. 34). It is not right that the idea of "camp" in Lev. 14,1 ff. is interpreted as

Israel's whole ancient history is unintelligible if P and D in their present form have existed as official codes during the time of the judges and the kings.<sup>1)</sup> There is not – in the old narratives – one single sanctuary only. Sacrifices are offered all over the country. And it is not an expression of treason towards the laws, for we see that Israel's best men, men like Elijah and Gideon, do this, even when they restore the right cult of Yahweh (1 Kings. 18,32, cf. 19,10; Judg. 6,25; 13,19–20). Such things are inconceivable on the assumption that P's idea of a sole legitimate place of sacrifice was known as law. There is, indeed, a chief sanctuary at Shiloh (Judg. 21,4; 1 Sam. 1–4), and 1 Kings 3,4 mentions "the great high place" at Gibeon. If this latter passage were to be interpreted as in 2 Chr. 1,3 of the Tabernacle it would have been expressly said. And above all, if the Tabernacle had been standing at Shiloh, and if the laws of P, always naming the Tabernacle as place of sacrifice, had been in force, then the story-tellers would not have described Samuel as sacrificing at Ramah (1 Sam. 7,17), Mizpah (9,13), Bethlehem (16,4–5), or Gilgal (10,8, cf. 13,8f.). On the other hand, when the Chronicler describes corresponding phenomena he always does so according to P. Only in one place does he not alter the old tradition in accordance with P. 1 Chron. 13 is so strongly controlled by 2 Sam. 6 that he has the Ark transferred from Kirjath Jearim, not to Gibeon, where the Tabernacle according to 2 Chron. 1,3 is said to stand, but to Jerusalem.

To these circumstances, that during the time of the Judges and the early time of the monarchy there was no monopoly attached to a single sanctuary, corresponds the description in the laws belonging to the older strata. The Book of the Covenant does not speak of "*one* altar", but only of "*an* altar" (Ex. 20,23–24) and says that "in all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee". Here is no idea of a cultic centralisa-

identical with the "land" in vv. 33ff. That the laws concerning the exclusion of lepers from the towns and the execution of criminals outside the camp presuppose a plurality of sanctuaries, is also wrong – at least it cannot be proved by referring to the fact that these regulations were in force in most ancient times. This only means that P has taken over ancient material, not that he has given up the idea of centralisation or even that he has not known it. It cannot be proved that "nach dem Sprachgebrauch des P bedeutet also "Lager" jede Stadt und Tempelzone zugleich", and that the Tabernacle is the "Urbild" not only of the Solomonian temple, but of all sanctuaries in Israel. The plurals of Num. 5,3, cf. 13,19 prove nothing in this respect. Num. 5,9 only speaks on the basis of the fiction of the wanderings as background, not of towns in Canaan.

<sup>1)</sup> This does not involve a denial of the often repeated opinion that the *material* of these codes is old. What matters is the interpretation of the material as taken up into the two "priestly" systems, D and P.

tion<sup>1</sup>). – In this passage the laws of P are not presupposed. This is evident from the description of the altar, which is built of earth and without steps. The latter are presupposed by the regulation of P concerning the trousers of the priests (Ex. 28,42; cf. Ez. 44,18). The altar of Ex. 20,24 is in no way reconcilable with that of P. The latter however corresponding to later practice must be the latest and a corrective to the earlier of Ex. 20,24, just as the claim of centralisation in Dt. 12 corrects Ex. 20<sup>2</sup>).

Thus it is evident that the earlier laws and earlier history correspond to one another concerning the place of the cult. The same is true of the picture given by *Genesis*, where the JE sections always describe the Patriarchs in relation to several cult-places. These strata therefore represent the same idea as Ex. 20,24; they do not know the deuteronomic idea of the cultic centralisation. On the other hand, the P stratum of *Genesis* does not give any description of offerings or places of offerings during the age of the Patriarchs. According to P, the cult has not been revealed to Israel before the time of Moses, cf. that Noah in the story of the flood does not distinguish between clean and unclean animals, while in the verses commonly assigned to J he makes this distinction<sup>3</sup>). The Yehovistic strand accordingly is older than both D and P, and this is then corroborated by the whole argument of *Wellhausen*, whether we work on a theory of oral tradition or not.

The next question then is the determination of *relations between D and P*.

As said above, it is generally assumed, and I cannot see that it has been seriously disputed, that while the claim of centralisation in D is fighting for acknowledgement, in P it is the presupposition. Only in Ph we have the commandment of centralisation in its militant form, but a more Jerusalemite form than in D<sup>4</sup>). For the priority of D speaks also the use made of D's commandment of centralisation in the deuteronomistic framework of the Book of Kings. Here it is applied as critical norm to pass judgment upon the different kings. P on the other hand seems unknown to these books. This argumentum e silentio gets some weight when so many other instances support the theory.

<sup>1</sup>) *Johs. Pedersen*, *Hebræisk Grammatik* (2nd ed.), § 118c, against the theory that *bēkōl hammākōm* is dogmatic correction for *bēkōl makōm* (GK § 127c). *Johs. Pedersen* will translate the text as the Rev. Version: "in every place", without alterations, referring to Gen. 20,13; Deut. 4,3, and to the fact that the article is often left out in poetic and rhetoric style (Is. 1,5: *kōl rō's*: the entire head; cf. also the translations of the LXX and Pesh.).

<sup>2</sup>) cf. upon the whole *Dillmann's* important commentary on Ex. 20,24.

<sup>3</sup>) It is not sufficient to refer to the commentary of *Jacob* to refute this argument.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. my *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie*, pp. 37 ff.



Other cultic relations are just as good as proofs. As example may be mentioned the relations between *Priests and Levites*<sup>1)</sup>. In the earlier parts of JE we do not find priests in the same sense as in P. Every family head is entitled to sacrifice. But most important is it that while *D assigns priestly rights to all Levites*, *P introduces the distinction between Priests and Levites*, the latter being subordinated to the sons of Aaron as the rightful priests. If D had known the hierarchical order of P it could not have written Dt. 18 and other passages. That P is later is also clear from the description of the relations between the classes in *Mal.* who at least in part keeps up the ideas of Dt.<sup>2)</sup> The system of P is met with in the memoirs of *Nehemiah*.<sup>3)</sup>

Concerning the relations between J and E, so far as they can be separated, we must only refer to what was said above,<sup>4)</sup> pointing to the probability of E being somewhat younger than J.

Proceeding to discuss the question of *absolute chronology* the *Deuteronomistic problem* becomes acute.

The theory of *De Wette*<sup>5)</sup>, already found in the writings of *Jerome* and *Chrysostom*<sup>6)</sup>, that the deuteronomistic law is to be combined with the *reform of king Josiah* in 622 B.C., is based upon the observation that the narrative of the reform 2 Kings. 22–23 directly refers to claims advanced by Dt. It is described how the centralisation of the cultus is carried through and the whole reformation is wound up with a Passover festival in the temple, not at home, in accordance with the deuteronomistic Passover regulations. And before all this the temple has been cleaned of the elements of foreign cultus, against which Dt. pours out its furious hatred: The cult of the *stars*: Dt. 17,3, cf. 2 Kings. 23,4,5,11; of *Ashera*: Dt. 16,21, cf. 2 Kings. 23,4,6,7; the *sacrifice of children*: Deut. 18,10, cf. 2 Kings. 23,10; the persons connected with the *sexual rites* of Canaan: Dt. 23,18, cf. 2 Kings 23,7; the *mašsebōth*: Dt. 12,3,16,22, cf. 2 Kings 23,14; *foreign oracles*: Dt. 18,11, cf. 2 Kings 23,24. Of special importance is that the narrative 2 Kings. 23,9 regrets that *Dt. 18,6–8 was not obeyed*. This must mean that the law was no work of Jerusalemite priests – for the breach of Dt. 18,6–8 was in their favour – and no forgery by the Jerusalemite priest who announced the discovery of the law hidden in the temple. And it must prove that the author of the narrative of the reform must belong to the same circles as the law<sup>7)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Wellhausen* Prol., 6th ed. p. 115 and pp. 133 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. my *Studier over det zadok. præsteskabs historie*, pp. 71 ff.

<sup>3)</sup> op. cit., pp. 73 ff.

<sup>4)</sup> pp. 47 ff.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. p. 13.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. loc. cit.

<sup>7)</sup> cf. *Oesterley and Robinson* I, p. 57 f. I only disagree in their believing too strongly in the theory of Dt. being akin to *reforming* prophets like Hosea (cf. my ch. II in *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie*).

But the decisive point is the commandment of *centralisation*. The description in the Book of Kings intends to tell us that under Hezekiah and Josiah the deuteronomic claim was first carried into effect, and that Josiah did it under the impression of the discovery of the code hidden in the temple. There can be no doubt that the relation of the reform in 2 Kings 23 is a source of first importance<sup>1</sup>).

That Deuteronomy on the other hand, *in its present form*, is later, from exilic times, is seen in the speech of promise in ch. 30 and is the truth in the assumption of e.g. *Hölscher*, *Mowinckel* and *Johs. Pedersen*, that it has nothing to do with the reform of Josiah<sup>2</sup>).

The dating of Dt. given here presents the *problem of the Mosaic origin* of the book in a most acute form. The book introduces Moses not as author, but as preacher. This corresponds to common usage in the historical books and in ancient historiography upon the whole<sup>3</sup>). The books of Kings and Chronicles introduce David and Solomon as orators, making speeches which these kings hardly would have understood. Upon the whole *pseudonymity* is very widespread in antiquity and must not be confounded with forgery. The Neo-Platonist *Jamblichos* praised the Pythagoreans, because they published their books not in their own name, but in the name of their teacher, thereby renouncing their own fame<sup>4</sup>).

Deuteronomy, or rather the nucleus being the law of the reformation of 622, in this way becomes the pivot, round which the whole question of absolute chronology revolves. In relation to D the age of the other strata must be dated. But the absolute dating is more difficult.

*Generally J is considered the most ancient.* Both J and E seem to be representatives of views older than the age of the great prophets of the 8th century. The dating of these sources is generally attempted on the assumption that both the earlier strata can be followed right through the historical books, J down to the disruption of Solomon's kingdom, E to the end of the Judahite

<sup>1</sup>) *Hölscher* in *Eucharisterion* Herrmann Gunkel dargebracht.... I, p. 208 f.

<sup>2</sup>) Literature is registered in the excursus in *Johs. Pedersen*. Israel III-IV. Concerning my own opinion I refer readers not only to *Die josianische Reform* (1926), but also to *Studier over det zadok. præsteskabs historie* (1931), ch.2., cf. also *Hulst*, *Het karakter van den cultus in Deuteronomium* (1938).—Conc. the date of the law of the king (17,14–20) cf. my *Die jos. Ref.* p. 89. The law is extremely impractical and markedly deuteronomistic in wording. But this cannot be an argument for its post-exilic origin (cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 238) in an ideological programme like D. It is polemic against the existing kingship.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. e.g. *E. Meyer*, *Geschichte des Altertums* IV, 1 (1939), p. 250.

<sup>4</sup>) *Clemen*, *Paulus* I, p. 8; cf. *Torm*, (Dansk) *Teologisk Tidsskrift* 1905, p. 411, and his book *Die Psychologie der Pseudonymität* (1932).

monarchy in 587. But this theory<sup>1)</sup> must be considered very problematic. We must remember that the strata have been fluid through most of their history, material being added down into post-exilic times, so that they, just like Deuteronomy, have not got their final form till this time. The dating attempted can only affect the assumed primary stem of the stratum in question. But here the connection between 2 Kings. 23 and Deut. is a corner stone not to be shaken.

We can be more explicit concerning the later stratum, P. When we call it "later", it is no judgement passed upon the material nor upon greater complexes like P<sup>h</sup>. Archaeological finds have e.g. made it clear that the sacrifices are old institutions, related to Canaanite customs. Lev. 7,32 has been amply illustrated by the many right forelegs of oxen, sheep and other animals found in rubbish pits of the temple at Lachish, dating from Canaanite days<sup>2)</sup>. But concerning P as a whole we may say, that looking for the traces of P's effects in history such traces are not clearly visible till after 500 B.C. A prophet like *Malachi* in certain respects is mostly influenced by D, but in some respects also by P<sup>3)</sup>. *Chronicles*, on the other hand, exhibit markedly stronger influence of P. And the memoirs of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, earlier than ca. 390, seem definitely acquainted with the system of P. This stratum therefore must be considered earlier than these two men. But again we make the reservation that it is not excluded that some elements may be later, e.g. the chapter on the Day of Atonement, if the argumentum e silentio of Neh. 8 should be of any value in this connection; but it cannot be said that it is compelling<sup>4)</sup>. But how far are we to go back behind Ezra? The feeble witness of *Malachi* does not suffice to prove that P originated in his time. The relations with *Ezekiel* are of some importance. The laws in Ez. 40ff. are – in spite of many differences – very much related to P, but the differences are so essential that it would be rather difficult to imagine P as an authoritative document in the same circles as Ez. 40ff. Especially the theory concerning the classes of the hierarchy (Ez. 44,10ff.) speaks against this. Ez. represents an

<sup>1)</sup> See *Mowinkel* in *Det gamle testamente oversatt...* II, p. 343; *Hölscher* in *Eucharisterion*, Herrmann Gunkel dargebracht... I, p. 182 (against *Benzinger*); *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung* (1942), cf. also the cautious remarks by *Pfeiffer*, p. 147, concerning J.

<sup>2)</sup> *Finegan*, *Light from the ancient Past* (1947), p. 138, referring to *G. E. Wright*, *American Journ. of Archaeol.* 1941, p. 634.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Studier over det zadok. præsteskab*, pp. 71ff.

<sup>4)</sup> *Egon Johannesen*, *Studier over Esras og Nehemjas Historie*, p. 299: We do not know whether the Day of Atonement was celebrated in the year of Ezra's reform or not; it does not concern the Ezra-source, being of no importance for the work of Ezra.



earlier step in the development of the history of the hierarchy. But the same is the case with Ph. Accordingly it may be supposed that what literary critics may call P<sup>g</sup> has approximately the same relations to Ez. as to Ph: It is later, but the laws of Ez. have, unlike those of Ph, not been received in the corpus juris of P. If the *Book of Ezekiel* in its present form belongs to the time between 537 and 516<sup>1)</sup>, P must be later and may be dated to the period between Zerubabel and Malachi. All these programmes, Ph, Ez. 40ff., and P (including Ph) are probably expressions of different circles inside the Zadokite priesthood, discussing the restoration of the Jewish community after the exile, and all of them base their collections on ancient material.

It is commonly assumed that they have been created by the exiles in *Babylon*. In favour of the *Babylonian origin of P* the *schematic* character of the regulations concerning the Levitical cities (Num. 35) is referred to. The descriptions are given quite theoretically. The town is regarded as a mathematical point without any idea of concrete geographical situations. This is presumably best understood as the work of an "author" living outside Palestine. Of similar character are the injunctions concerning the *Jubile-Year* (Lev. 25), which are supposed never to have had any practical significance outside the writing desk of its author<sup>2)</sup>.

With the dates here given it is not said that because the central stem of P is later than Ez. 40ff. all the material comes from this time. Ph is earlier. And the institutions described by P are often earlier, and even very old. It is the form of P which is late<sup>3)</sup>.

The common opinion of literary criticism concerning the relative and absolute age of the strata was confirmed in a remarkable way by the *documents of Elephantine*<sup>4)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. below, p. 225.

<sup>2)</sup> *Johs. Pedersen*, *Israel I-II*, p. 89. But *Pedersen* also draws our attention to the testimony given by the material of these laws to the old-Israelite conception of kindred and property, being an expression of the reaction against the forces counteracting it, which forces.... were closely connected, partly with the city-culture, and partly with the monarchy. - Cf. also *Dillmann-Ryssel's* commentary on Lev., p. 664.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Driver*, Introduction, p. 142.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Nöldeke*, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, vol. II, p. 203: The ignorance of the Elephantine-Jews concerning the deuteronomic claims of centralized worship proves that the Pentateuch in its accepted form had not yet reached them. That means that every possibility of dating the final redaction of the Pentateuch to a time earlier than Ezra must be dismissed.

## THE COMBINATION OF THE STRATA

The current idea of literary criticism concerning the combination of the "sources" is that it has been carried into effect through a series of "redactions". First, J and E were joined to one another by the redactor called RJE, then D was incorporated by RD, and finally P entered the great complex of the Torah through the work of RP.

It is also generally stressed that it is impossible that P himself should have incorporated the old sources in his work<sup>1</sup>). P seems to be too polemical against much of the material of his predecessors. He could not approve of the Yahwistic (J) theory that the invocation of the name of Yahweh began in the days of Seth and Enosh (Gen. 4.26), cf. P's own idea Ex. 6.3. And he could not accept the picture given of the patriarch Jacob in the earlier sources. These are only two examples of his view of the cult as having been revealed only to Moses, so that no offerings and distinctions between clean and unclean animals are possible in the time before the founder of the cult. Nor could P acknowledge many theories of D. His hierarchical system is different, and so is e.g. his idea of the Paschal customs. P must have intended to *replace* the earlier works by his own collections, just as the school behind the Chronistic work must have intended to oust the deuteronomistic work (Dtr.). I cannot bring myself to accept the idea that this conception of the relations between P and the old sources is only due to a Western mode of thinking<sup>2</sup>). Authors like D and P, who take up a polemical position, cannot be believed to overlook the discrepancies between their own basic ideas and those of the predecessors whom they want to supersede.

Accordingly I am inclined to adhere to a theory of an essential truth in the idea of a Deuteronomistic and an "Aaronitic" (P) "redaction"<sup>3</sup>). On the other hand, if E is to be regarded as described by Mowinckel<sup>4</sup>), the assumption of an RJE cannot be called necessary. Here E may have been a later "tradent".

<sup>1</sup>) As assumed by *Klostermann*; it is also the consequence of *Engnell's* opinion, that P is the last "tradent" of the Pentateuch.

<sup>2</sup>) So in many places *Engnell*. — Of course it must be acknowledged that "Western thinking" often has led to misconceptions of OT passages. Oriental thinking can place ideas, which to us seem to exclude one another, at the side of one another. Places like "Heaven" and "temple", "tomb" and "Hades" are identical, although seemingly locally different. But in expressly polemical texts such identifications could not be accepted, even by Orientals.

<sup>3</sup>) I also think that there must be some truth in the observation of e.g. *Steuernagel* (p. 264), that traces of deuteronomistic editing are only found in the old strata, never in P. RD has altered the name of the Ark in many places, but never in a P-text.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. above, p. 48.

## THE LAW AND THE FOLLOWING BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Some time before 400 B.C. the Pentateuch seems to have been relatively finished<sup>1)</sup>. We say "relatively". For it does not mean that work had ceased upon it. This is proved by the different treatment of Ex. 35, ff. in the LXX, cf. also Ex. 20, 13-15; Gen. 31, 47 ff.; Num. 1, 24-27; 6, 22-27; 26, 15-47. The Canon of the *Samaritans* only comprises the Five Books of Moses. This must also mean that the Law was completed before the schism became acute. But deplorably enough we cannot for certain determine the actual date of this event.<sup>2)</sup> That the Pentateuch like the rest of the Old Testament for many centuries had a very fluid text is also evident from other sources. The *Antiquities of Josephus* (from the end of the first. Century A.D.) in many places assert themselves to be a "translation" of the Bible. But the many perplexing deviations from the text known to us has generally been explained away by assuming that the not very trustworthy personage who was their author had used a traditional collection of story-telling, including much material taken from other sources. But this very probable theory<sup>3)</sup> does not explain the deviations from the story of the Pentateuch. This is more acceptably understood on the assumption of "*vulgar texts*", current among the people. That *Josephus* professes to have used authoritative copies from the temple at Jerusalem may be dismissed by referring to his unsavoury person. But the tradition used by him cannot be explained as simple forgery. And many instances point to the existence of texts of the OT differing widely from what is now known through the recension of the later Massoretes, more related to the Samaritan Pentateuch<sup>4)</sup>. The work on the Pentateuch was not finished until it was revised in the schools of Massoretes in the centuries after the destruction of the second temple, when the present *textus receptus* was placed in the hands of the Jewish people.<sup>5)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 70. The eloquent silence of Jerusalem concerning the petition of the Elephantine-Jews in 408 must prove that The Law with its centralistic parts (D and P) must have been in full force in Jerusalem at that time, while it had not reached the Egyptian diaspora (cf. above, p. 70, n. 4.).

<sup>2)</sup> *Rothstein*, *Juden und Samaritaner* (1908), on the basis of Hag. 2 dated it to the time of Zerubbabel; *Mowinkel*, *Statholderen Nehemia* (1916), pp. 208 ff., to 437; *Hölscher*, *Geschichte der isr. u. jüd. Rel.* (1922), to the time of Pompey (ca. 60 B.C.).

<sup>3)</sup> Represented above all by the article of *Hölscher* on *Josephus* in *Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. I, pp. 50 ff, *Kahle*, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes* (Theol. Studien und Kritiken 1915, pp. 399-439). *Gerleman*, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1947, pp. 160 ff.

<sup>5)</sup> On the importance of this work, see *Kahle* in the *Bertholet-Festschrift* (1949).



Another problem connected with the Pentateuch must however be touched upon here.

Literary criticism generally supposes that the "documents" of which it was composed are continued through at least the Book of Joshua. It therefore has been a much discussed question, Why was the Pentateuch separated from its natural continuation in that book? The explanation must obviously be found in the fact that the Law had Canonical authority. *The time of Moses was theologically normative*. The conception of certain prophets, e.g. Hosea, that the defection of Israel begins with the immigration into Canaan, cf. also the narratives in Num. 25, may also have played a rôle. Clearly, the concluding words of Dt. 34,7ff. attests this view, that the times of the Patriarchs and Moses are the normative age. Besides this, *Eissfeldt*<sup>1)</sup> refers to the *political conditions of the age of Artaxerxes I*. When the Jewish congregation was re-constituted through the work of Ezra and Nehemiah the Mosaic Law of the Pentateuch was acknowledged by the Persian king as its constitutional code. But simultaneously the Book of Joshua was separated from the Law on account of its political aspirations, claiming the possession of the whole of Palestine. The Persians would not accept a theory which might lead to attempts to re-create the Davidic empire. The Great King would only tolerate Israel as a purely religious congregation.

The latter speculations may be of some value. But of late the question has been put into a new light.

In his *Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* I<sup>2)</sup> *Martin Noth* has advanced the theory, that Deuteronomy originally was the introduction to the Deuteronomistic Work of History (Dtr.) without any original connection with the material of the later Pentateuch. The deuteronomistic work had its continuation in the Book of Joshua, according to *Noth* an adaptation of the old traditions relating the history of the immigration. *Noth's* idea also involves that the sources J, E, and P do not go beyond Num., and he supposes that P originally told of the death of Moses in the later part of Num. This story was continued in a fresh work by the Deuteronomistic Work of History. Dt. originally had nothing to do with the first four books of the Pentateuch.

These ideas have been taken up by *Engnell* in his *Gamla testamentet* I<sup>3)</sup>. He rejects the theory advanced by *Noth* that the old sources have been taken over in P through a redactor and – as mentioned before – he supposes that P is the last "tradent". *Engnell* introduces – instead of the "Hexateuch"

<sup>1)</sup> p. 288, cf. *Vischer*, *Das Christuszeugnis des Alten Testaments* II (1942), p. 9.

<sup>2)</sup> *Schriften der Königsberger gelehrten Gesellschaft* (1943).

<sup>3)</sup> pp. 210ff.

which has never existed – the name “Tetrateuch” as designation for the Books of Gen.–Num.

This theory, however, does not solve all difficulties. And above all it does not do justice to a fact which has been especially stressed by *von Rad*<sup>1)</sup>. *Von Rad* works on the traditional lines of the Documentary Hypothesis. And he has pointed out that all the sources exhibit a common plan which is older than all of them and given by tradition, the common Israelite tradition of the wanderings to the Holy Land, with *Albrecht Alt*’s expression the “Landnahme-Tradition”<sup>2)</sup>. This old tradition *von Rad* has found in *old cultic lyrics*, which must be the presuppositions of the prose narratives. The “Landnama traditions” in Jos. 1–12 (and Judg. 1) are – in written form – presuppositions of J and E, which have been composed as introductions to the traditions of immigration.<sup>3)</sup>

The Yahwist (J) has supplemented the original Landnama-tradition with the *Sinai section*. Most traditions of Israel’s “History of Salvation” (Dt. 26, 5b–9; 6, 20–24; Ps. 78, 105, 136; Ex. 15, 1; 1 Sam. 12, 8; Jos. 24) are remarkable through the fact that this feature is lacking in their description. It is not found until we come to late poems like Ps. 106 and the 9th chapter of Neh. The Sinai-traditions which presumably belong to a legend of some festival<sup>4)</sup> is according to common conception a foreign element in the Exodus story. It tears the traditions of the sojourn in *Kadesh* asunder<sup>5)</sup>. The Kadesh- and the Sinai-traditions are strata which compete with one another, but J has quite consciously incorporated the Sinai-traditions in his story of the Exodus, where it is an independent feature in this story-teller’s picture of the History of Salvation. Further, the Yahwist has formed his story of the *Patriarchs* with

<sup>1)</sup> Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs (1938).

<sup>2)</sup> The expression “Landnam” comes from the old Icelandic sagas and signifies originally the immigration of Norwegian chiefs who left Norway, because they resented the policy of king Harald Haarfager, who united Norway under his sceptre in the 9th century A. D.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Möhlenbrink*, ZATW 1938, p. 267 on Jos., *Rudolph*, Der Elohist von Ex. bis Jos., p. 272 on Judg. 1, and *von Rad*, op. cit., p. 68, n. 109. – Here the parallel ideas of modern form-critical investigations of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels could be noted: The nucleus here has been the story of the Passion and Resurrection, to which the collections of sayings and stories of Jesus have been added as introductory parts. – In *Teologisk Tidskrift* (Helsinki 1946, p. 159) *R. Gyllenberg* has hinted at other analogies between New Testament investigations and the present debate concerning the Pentateuch.

<sup>4)</sup> *v. Rad*, p. 19, cf. *Mowinkel*, Le Décalogue (1927), p. 129.

<sup>5)</sup> *Wellhausen*, Prolegomena, pp. 347ff. *Ed. Meyer*, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme (1906), p. 60f.; *Gressmann*, Mose und seine Zeit (1914) p. 234f. cf. pp. 164ff.; *v. Rad*, pp. 12ff.

a clear theological motive. He has underlined the promises to the Fathers concerning the possession of the Holy Land, and he has combined the covenant with the Fathers with the Sinai-Covenant in such a manner as to place them under the common angle of view of promise and fulfilment. And as *scopus* of the whole story stands the conquest of the Promised Land. – Finally, J has placed *the primeval story* at the head of the whole saga and so “given the aetiology of all Israel’s aetiologies”<sup>1)</sup>. The beginning of the Patriarchal story, Gen. 12,1–9, which has never been an independent legend, was created by the Yahwist as his answer to the apparently hopeless end of the primeval story, the story of the Tower of Babel. The Patriarchal, the Exodus-, and the Landnama-traditions are a great History of Salvation, revealing God’s plan for the restitution of his world by his Servant Abraham’s seed, to save it from the curse conjured down upon it by the Fall of the first man and woman. In this way the Yahwist has created a conception of universalistic character, which has left its mark on all other traditions of the Hexateuch.

What is to be underlined here is the conception of *promise and fulfilment* as the scarlet thread through the story. The “Tetrteuch” of *Noth* and *Engnell* is a torso without the *scopus* so clearly indicated in the Patriarchal and Mosaic story. Everything is subordinated to the promise of the possession of the Holy Land, and therefore the connection with the “Landnama-story” must not be broken. The Pentateuch without the Book of Joshua or its parallel Judg. 1 is as incomplete as the Gospels without the stories of the Resurrection. *Von Rad*’s book is also a strong and well prepared pleading for the opinion that J is not only a *collector* of old legends (he is that too), but also an *author* – this word here used by me without special “bookish” associations of mind! –

But this means that the problem of the relations between the “Law” and the following books of the *prophetae priores* cannot be solved in the Gordian way of *Noth* and *Engnell*. The Law with its continuation in a Landnama-story and the Deuteronomic Work (Dtr.) have been dovetailed into one another. On the other hand, *Mowinkel* has shown<sup>2)</sup> that *P* is at work in the traditions collected in Jos. 13–19. And the first part of Jos., the old sagas, are, like the parallel in Judg. 1, the *scopus* and culmination of the older story-telling strata in the Pentateuch. The duplication of the Landnama-story (Jos. 1–12 and its parallel, Judg. 1) witnesses to this dovetailing too – if Jos. belonged to Dtr. Judg. 1 may have belonged to the original Pentateuchal story. We cannot determine this with certainty. The result must be the justification of

<sup>1)</sup> *von Rad*, p. 60.

<sup>2)</sup> Zur Frage nach den dokumentarischen Quellen in Josua 13–19 (Avhandlingler utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo) 1947.



the old theory, that the Law has been separated from the continuation in the *prophetae priores* on purely theological grounds, even to isolate the Law. But the right idea in the theory of *Noth* and *Engnell* is that Deuteronomy in this process has been isolated from the work to which it originally belonged. On the other hand, through this operation the story of the Pentateuch, as it was conceived by J on the background of Israel's traditional History of Salvation, has lost its scopus, which has been shunted into the second part of the Canon. These processes certainly do not belong to the age of oral tradition. They clearly presuppose *books*. But this is nothing new. The "book" has been a decisive feature in Judah's theology since the discovery of Josiah's code in 622. It is the characteristic feature of Ezra's work too. And the dovetailing of the two works, the old Landnama-story in the sources of the Hexateuch and the beginning of the Deuteronomistic Work of History, is a strong indication, that "sources", documents, could be worked into one another, so that the main ideas of the Documentary Hypothesis stand out clearly as not only Western anachronisms, but as Eastern facts, or at least probable possibilities<sup>1)</sup>.

#### THE PENTATEUCH AS RELIGIOUS DOCUMENT

"The Hexateuch in its present form has developed through the hands of redactors who have heard the witness of faith in every stratum in its characteristic particularity and have regarded it as binding. Without doubt the Hexateuch in its present form makes great claims on its readers with regard to understanding. Many ages, many men, many traditions and theologians have built up this giant work. A right understanding will be found only by him who does not regard the Hexateuch as a plane figure, but reads it with the consciousness of its third dimension, knowing that revelations and experiences of faith speak from its leaves".

These words of *von Rad*<sup>2)</sup> sum up what we have till now sketched, in a theological point of view. We must add that the Pentateuch is not only seen in its third dimension, if we are aware of its "literary" structure, its strata and their "redactions". Behind and in the strata stand out *oral traditions*, the many types of legend and poetry and law.

The Jewish name of the Pentateuch is "THE LAW". But THE LAW contains more than "law". It also embraces narrative and poetry as the great

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Mowinkel*, *Prophecy and Tradition*, pp. 19 ff. 64.

<sup>2)</sup> *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs*, p. 72.

framework of the Law from Sinai. This framework is found in D too, which does not contain only laws and admonitions, but also the recapitulating narrative of the "wanderings in the desert" in Dt. 1 ff. Originally this was part of the story of the promise to the fathers and its fulfilment in the conquest of the Holy Land. It was founded by the Yahwist, but inherited by him from old cultic ideologies, as expression of Israel's faith in its God and the universal task which he had set for his chosen people.

Studying the story of this ideology in the Law as it stands now, we see that the subsequent strata do not preserve the original conception of the Yahwist. A shifting has taken place in *nomistic* direction, away from the fundamental idea of the Yahwist, who aimed at an equilibrium between the point of view of the History of Salvation and that of the Law, or rather perhaps the predominance of the first. J as the first has "added" the Law (Gal. 3,19 ff). But still the Primeval and the Patriarchal Stories stand at the head, giving the Law its universalistic and evangelical signature (cf. Gal. 3,15-29). Not only the laws of the Sinai-section, and even in the bulky expansion of the latter in P, but also the description in the Patriarchal benedictions of Israel as the Saviour of the world is the LAW of Israel. As a whole therefore *the Pentateuch must be defined as a document which gives Israel its understanding, its aetiology of life*. Here, through narrative, poetry, prophecy, law, God's will concerning Israel's task in the world is revealed. The benedictions to the Patriarchs and their sons, and even the oracles of the heathen seer Balaam – as powerful, Divine words – created the destiny of Israel, pointed to God's will with his people, God's gracious promises to this nation. And the claims which it has to fulfil have been given in the regulations of the laws. THE LAW accordingly is a *religious Canon*, the written fundament of a religious community, and so ranges itself in the religious world-literature of the type "*Holy Scripture*"<sup>1</sup>. It contains both law and promise, law and gospel.

The separation of the *Book of Joshua* is in this connection also significant. Only the "golden age" of Moses is the canonical era. The separation of the Book of Joshua is an expression of the interpretation which the Jewish congregation of post-exilic days applied to the promises of the Law: The exile had shown that they had not been fulfilled.

The problem of the presumed "*redactions*" was that they had before them different representations of the fundamental History of Salvation, which had all of them reached some degree of canonical dignity – a parallel to our four canonical Gospels with their similarities and differences. And as the history of the priesthood in post-Exilic times develops towards a

<sup>1</sup>) See *van der Leeuw*, *Phänomenologie der Religion* (1933), pp. 411 ff.

compromise<sup>1)</sup>, so the Pentateuch itself is a compromise, or better, an attempt at a *harmony* of the different traditions. That the parallel strata have had a character of obligation to the community is revealed by the fact that so much material of partly antagonistic character has been combined<sup>2)</sup>. Under the presupposition of the canonisation – incipient or more developed – it may be believed that “redactors” were able to accept contradictions which could not be taken over by “tradents” with a definite programme like D and P. As pious people the “redactors” supposed that the contradictions in the holy texts were only due to their own short-sighted human understanding.

– This holiness of the strata, and of the complexes belonging to them as their presupposition in oral tradition, must get an extra emphasis on the background of the incipient attempts to define the *cultic* background of the narratives going on to-day. The outstanding work in this field is *Johs. Pedersen's* monograph on the *Passover story*<sup>3)</sup>. But many more texts may certainly be understood in this way. Already before *Pedersen's* analysis of Ex. 1–15 stories had been singled out as having some cultic background or being legends explaining cultic places, their origins and their sacred customs. The stories of the Creation and the Flood have been understood as holy texts of the New Year Festival<sup>4)</sup>. The Sinai-pericope is also supposed to belong to some ritual<sup>5)</sup>, and Deuteronomy is expressly said to have been appointed for reading to the congregation every seventh year at the Festival of Tabernacles (Dt. 31,9ff.). This is a sort of ritual reading in later ages, which must have corresponded to earlier usage during the time of oral transmission. Liturgies like Pss. 81 and 95 presuppose a recitation of the conditions of the covenant between Yahweh and his people<sup>6)</sup>, of legal character.

All these indications show that there is much to be done to investigate the Pentateuch from this point of view. And this is also of value when we try to explain, how it came to be Holy Scripture: Its parts had many connections with sacred sites and customs. Here we are at the beginnings of the History of the Canon, the later stages of which we have sketched in the General Introduction.

But in connection with the just mentioned indications of cultic relations of Pentateuchal texts we must make some further observations before concluding the treatment of this part of the Canon.

<sup>1)</sup> Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie (1931).

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Mowinkel*, Prophecy and Tradition, p. 28.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. above, p. 21, n. 2.

<sup>4)</sup> *Pedersen*, Israel III–IV, p. 749f.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. above p. 74.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. my Die josianische Reform, pp. 97ff. *Mowinkel*, Psalmenstudien V.



In a previous work<sup>1)</sup> I have observed that the texts of e.g. the "Passover-legend" (Ex. 1-15) cannot be regarded as a directly cultic legend in its present form. Its character is definitely *epic*, not dramatic, as the cultic Ras Shamra texts are supposed to be. The Passover-legend is no "programme of a cultic drama", and these texts cannot be used as patterns for the literary treatment of the Exodus-texts<sup>2)</sup>. *Widengren*<sup>3)</sup> has drawn attention to the brevity of the narrative elements of the Ras Shamra-texts, in contrast to the detailed manner of relation of the ritual parts. He points out that the text treats the complicated story of the goddess wandering to the Northern mountain of the gods with the dead god, his funeral and her mourning over him very sparingly, while the many sacrificial animals slaughtered by her are enumerated in great detail. Further, *Widengren*<sup>4)</sup> refers to *Delacroix*, who has singled out different literary elements in the myth. Probably we may say that in the Passover-legend myth developed into legend, with the definite element of "entertainment", often found even in "religious legends"<sup>5)</sup>.

Formally the Ras Shamra cultic texts differ from the Exodus-story, while they in respect of contents are akin to one another, setting aside the specifically Israelite spirit of the latter. But as a consequence of the formal differences they have to be treated differently when reviewed from the points of view of history of literature.

The legends of the Pentateuch, as far as they may be connected with cultic rituals, like other stories of the Old Testament of a similar kind<sup>6)</sup>, represent a new form of religious literature. They now stand in connection with the great epic of Israel, and have become different from the ritual myths of antiquity. They represent *historical religion*. *Engnell*<sup>7)</sup> rightly observes that the form in which the "Passover-legend" now stands before us is not the original one, but a "de-culticized", historicized representation. I think, however, that this should remind us that these texts are to be treated - "literarily" - in another way than cultic texts like the Ras Shamra rituals. The present Old Testament texts have left the stage where religion found expression in ritual drama. They have no longer any connection with an Altar. They preach, and so point forward to the Synagogue and the Pulpit of the Church. The

<sup>1)</sup> Det sakrale kongedømme, p. 15, n. 2-3.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Hvidberg*, Haandbog i Kristendomskundskab II, p. 233.

<sup>3)</sup> Religionens värld, p. 136. <sup>4)</sup> op. cit., p. 154, cf. also pp. 157 and 158.

<sup>5)</sup> Conc. this expression cf. I, pp. 233 and 237ff.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. my observations concerning the Story of the Ark in Sam., JBL, 1948.

<sup>7)</sup> Gamla testamentet I, p. 218f. - Cf. *Ringgren*'s similar view on Gen. 1-3, Svensk Exeg. Årsbok 1948, p. 19, and my remarks in JBL 1948, pp. 50ff.

Church unites both. Through later history of Israel we perceive the tendency to over-stress the service of the Word. The Synagogue more than the Temple is the real living-space of religion in these later days. But with the coming of the Church, cult and ritual, renewed and reinforced, grows to predominance in the Mediaeval Church. The service of the Word is again underlined by the Reformation. But rightly understood, the Church of the Reformation should be the place where both factors, Altar and Pulpit, ritual and history have their proper place, in steady equilibrium<sup>1</sup>).

Besides the *Literature* mentioned in the previous pages, I only refer to the list of Pfeiffer in his Introduction, pp. 867 ff., cf. pp. 856 ff. A clear representation of the history of Criticism is found in Coppens, *Histoire Critique des Livres de l'Ancien Testament*, 3rd ed. 1942, also with many references to current literature. A handy manual for students is given by D. C. Simpson, *Pentateuchal Criticism* (1924). The important views of Johs. Pedersen and his Swedish followers are found in their works referred to above.

A special study to be mentioned here is D. Daube, *Studies in Biblical Law* (1947), which did not reach till me after the completion of vol. I.

Readers are especially referred to the article of C. R. North on the Pentateuch, in *The OT and Modern Study* ed. by Rowley (1951), with bibliography; cf. also the *Appendix* at the end of this volume.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. the fine chapter on The Meaning of Worship in H. H. Rowley's book *The Rediscovery of the Old Testament* (1945).

## THE PROPHETS

The second part of the Jewish Canon is called the *Prophets*. It contains *eight books*. The first *four*, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings are *historical*. The bipartition of Sam. and Kings is not original<sup>1)</sup>. By the Jews these books are called *n<sup>e</sup>bī'im rīšōnīm*, *prophetae priores*. The last four, *n<sup>e</sup>bī'im 'ah<sup>a</sup>rōnīm*, *prophetae posteriores*, comprise Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Book of the Twelve Prophets, the latter counted as one book.<sup>2)</sup> The expressions "*priores*" and "*posteriores*" presumably apply to the order of the books in the Canon. It is generally assumed that *prophetae posteriores* have been the first to gain canonical dignity<sup>3)</sup> beside the Law, this dignity being later transferred also to the historical books. At a comparatively early date it was assumed that some of these books were written by prophets<sup>4)</sup>. – The order of *prophetae posteriores* sometimes differs from that given above, *Isaiah* in some manuscripts being placed after Ezekiel<sup>5)</sup>. The Talmud (*Baba bathra* 14b) accounts for this difference from the chronological order by saying that Jeremiah only speaks of destruction, Ezekiel both of destruction and consolation, Isaiah only of consolation! The latter contention is of course a proof that Deutero-Isaiah was considered Isaianic. Further, LXX has the Book of the Twelve before Is.–Dan. In some manuscripts Is. is found between Jer. and Ez.

*Literature on the Historical Books: Snaith*, in *The OT and Modern Study*, ed. by Rowley (1951), which however also deals with Ruth, Esther, and the Chronistic work. On the *prophetae posteriores*, *Eissfeldt*, *ibidem*.

### Prophetae Priores.

#### THE BOOK OF JOSHUA

##### Contents of the Book.

The 24 chapters of the Book of Joshua may be divided into *three sections*, the first two being nearly of the same size, the last one somewhat smaller.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. pp. 91, 96. <sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 129. <sup>3)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 25. <sup>4)</sup> cf. pp. 87, 91, 97. <sup>5)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 32.



1,1-12,24 describes the conquest of Western Palestine under the leadership of Joshua. 13,1-21,42 deals with the division of the conquered land between the tribes. 21,43-24,33 contains int. al. the farewell-speeches of Joshua, the story of the Covenant at Shechem (24,1-28) and, as conclusion of the narrative of the "Hexateuch", reports concerning the burial of Joshua, of the bones of Joseph, and Eleazar the son of Aaron.

As pointed out above<sup>1)</sup> this book contains the culmination, the indispensable conclusion of the "History of Salvation" related in the Pentateuch. It describes the fulfilment of the promises of God to the Fathers of Israel. But this must not make us believe that the book is not an independent work. Already the circumstance that it has been separated from the Law witnesses to this<sup>2)</sup>. But it must be admitted that scholars have not always paid due attention to it. It has been common to regard the Book of Joshua as "ein dem Pentateuch auf allen Punkten voraussetzender *Anhang* zu demselben"<sup>3)</sup>. It is true, however, that *Wellhausen* continues his verdict by some words giving some acknowledgement of its independence<sup>4)</sup>.

#### Authenticity and Structure.

That the Book of Joshua is *not a unity* is just as clear as in the case of the Pentateuch. As usual this is made out through discrepancies and contradictions.

According to 4,19 Israel crossed the Jordan on the 10th of the first month and celebrated Passover on the 14th. But between these two events we are told of a circumcision of the people. This makes the description of chs. 4-5 impossible, the wound-fever having prevented the celebration of the festival. In 3,1 ff. too the chronology is not clear, 11,21 ff. does not accord with 15,13 ff. The common hypothesis of documents assumes double narratives, and even if the analysis in Jos. is more difficult than in other places it is at least obvious that the book is no unity.

Accordingly the tradition of Joshua as *author* of the book cannot be upheld. Like Moses he then would have told of his own death and subsequent events. The *Talmud* (Baba bathra 14b) solves this problem – as in the case of the Law and the Books of Samuel – by assuming that the book has been completed by others, in this case the High Priest Eleazar and his son Phinehas. The

<sup>1)</sup> p. 75.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 73.

<sup>3)</sup> *Wellhausen*, Composition des Hexateuchs... (1899) p. 116 (the italics are mine).

<sup>4)</sup> "nicht, dass darin das gleiche Material verarbeitet vorliege". – Despite many correct observations the treatment of the book by *Ed. Meyer*, *Gesch. d. Altertums II* (1931), p. 214 is completely unjustified.

frequent formula "*unto this day*" (4,9; 5,9; 6,25; 7,26 et al.) proves that the book was written long after the events related. Against this stands only a "*we*" in 5,1, which might be interpreted as an expression of the author's being a contemporary of the events. But such a "*we*" must not necessarily hint at more than corresponding expressions in the introductory homilies of Dt., not being able to contradict the overwhelming evidence for the later origin of the book. And moreover the text of 5,1 is not certain, many manuscripts and most of the old translations reading "*they*". From 18,9 we might at most conclude that the author knew a list from the time of Joshua, and 24,26 only shows that Joshua according to tradition was regarded as author of certain laws. Such passages are no proof of the correctness of tradition, but only evidence of its existence, and they get their proper light from the certain arguments against it.

Proceeding to consider the *structure* of the book we find in the history of criticism that scholars generally presuppose that the *sources of the Pentateuch* are continued in the Book of Joshua, but on the other hand are a little surprised at the fact that the separation of the documents has no great success. Most of them therefore underline the uncertainty of the Documentary Hypothesis in this case. The question is, however, if we have not too much based our work upon the supposition that the documentary tetragram JEDP must be maintained in Jos.

The justification of the current view is found in the frequently mentioned fact that the Book of Jos. is the necessary continuation and *scopus* of the narrative of the Pentateuch, and that the separate strata of the Pentateuch must have had their individual description of the fulfilment of the promises. Further, it is obvious that large parts of the book exhibit a strong influence of *deuteronomistic* diction. And also *P* seems involved, although this appears to be more problematic.

The treatment of these problems was placed on a new base through points of view advocated by *Albrecht Alt* and his pupils.

The main works are: *Alt*, Die Gaue Judas unter Josia (Palästina-jahrbuch 1925, pp. 100ff.); Das System der Stammesgrenzen im Buche Josua (Sellin-Festschrift, 1927, pp. 13ff.); Josua (in Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments, herausg. v. *Volz*, *Stummer* und *Hempel*, Beih. ZATW 1936, pp. 13ff.); *Möhlenbrink*, Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua (ZATW 1938, pp. 238ff.); *M. Noth*, Das Buch Josua (in *Eissfeldt's Handbuch z. AT*). Important points of view are also found in papers by *Alt* and *Noth*, in Palästina-jahrbuch 1938 and 1939. *Noth* carries on his work in his important book mentioned p. 19, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I. Concerning the Book of Joshua *Noth* is followed by *Engnell*, Gamla testamentet I, pp. 235ff., with some reservations. In Zur Frage nach dokumentarischen Quellen in Josua 13-19 (1946) *Mowinkel* has criticized the views of



*Alt* and *Noth*. While *Engnell* thinks that these chapters form a special tradition-complex, mainly handed down by the "Deuteronomist", and rejects *Noth's* assumption of a later "redaction", *Mowinkel* holds that these chapters have been composed by *P* on the basis of tradition. He finds that the author was acquainted with Judg. 1, but otherwise denies his use of documentary sources, this in opposition to *Alt*, who finds two main documents in 13-1-21,42, viz. a) description of the boundaries of the tribes, dating from the time before the introduction of the monarchy, and b) a list of cities in the kingdom of Judah, distributed in the 12 provinces of this kingdom, in its present form dating from the time of Josiah (ca. 620). According to *Alt* and *Noth* these documents have been combined to describe the possessions of Israel during the time of immigration. This process caused that some redactionary work had to be done, and the simple enumeration of points of the boundaries in the first named document was transformed into a descriptive text. The combined document had its super- and subscriptions in 14,1a 4b, 5 and 19,49a, and it did not mention Joshua, but made the Israelites the authors of the distribution of the land. But further on the combined document was inserted in a story of Joshua, getting different additions before being worked into the Book of Joshua. — *Mowinkel's* view seems to be more simple<sup>1)</sup>.

1 chs. 1-12 and in 24 *Noth* also finds a great deal of pre-deuteronomistic material. The nucleus is a series of aetiological legends (2-9) and two hero-legends (10, and 11,1-9). The aetiological legends represent mostly Benjamite traditions and were attached to the sanctuary at Gilgal, but the great influence of this sanctuary caused their extension to common-Israelitic property. The two hero-legends were originally attached to localities in Southern and Northern Palestine, but are now used to describe the conquest of these parts of the country. All these legends have been bound together by a "collector", who does not know the rebuilding of Jericho in the days of Ahab (1 Kings 16, 34); further, he knows that Hazor had been laid waste before the time of Solomon (11,10-15), but not that Ai in the Iron Age and until the 10th century was inhabited by members of the tribe of Benjamin (8,28). Accordingly the "collector" did his work between the disruption of Solomon's kingdom and the time of Ahab.

In pre-deuteronomistic time, but in a way not quite clear to us, ch. 24, according to *Noth* has been added (by the collector?), and the whole story has been strongly worked over and provided with glosses. An ancient addition (by the collector<sup>2)</sup>) is the reference to the "Book of Ishaar" (10,12-14). This quotation is indeed a strong support for the assumption of *Noth*, that some of the material of the old sagas had already been fixed in writing at a very early date.

In the question, if and how this pre-deuteronomistic material is related to the strata of the Pentateuch, *Rudolph* holds that the foundation in Jos. belongs to *J*, contrary to the common opinion that the pre-deut. sections come from *E*<sup>3)</sup>. What makes it impossible to identify the pre-deut. material with any of the Yehovistic (*J* or *E*) strata is, that presumably it is of the same age, at least, as the oldest of them (cf. the date of the "collector"). *Rudolph's* only argument for Yahwistic origin is the negative that nothing speaks against it.

<sup>1)</sup> The list of Levitical cities in Jos. 21 (cf. 1 Chron 6) is by *Albright* (Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume 1945, pp. 49ff.) referred to the time of David and Solomon. *Albright* is followed by *G. E. Wright*, in *The Study of the Bible...* ed. Willoughby, p. 86.

<sup>2)</sup> *Noth*, Commentary, p. 38.

<sup>3)</sup> *Rudolph*, *Der Elohist von Ex. bis Jos.*, pp. 164ff.



Perhaps another theory of *Rudolph's* may carry us a little farther. He thinks that *Judg. 1*, being a parallel to the Book of Joshua, and commonly regarded as Yahwistic, is pre-Yahwistic<sup>1</sup>). If this is true, then these theories may be combined with the Stratification Hypothesis. Both J and E had their culmination in a description of the "Landnama"<sup>2</sup>), a description not created by them, but found by them in fixed form<sup>3</sup>). They both wrote their "History of Salvation" as "pre-history" to the story of the fulfilment of the promises<sup>4</sup>). This explains that *Jos.* in its present shape has been enlarged with glosses from *Judg. 1* (15,63; 17,10-11; 19,10-39)<sup>5</sup>).

The *deuteronomistic editing* of this material is very clearly to be perceived in 1,1-18 8,30-35; 12,1-24; 21,43-22,6 + 23,1-6. 23 is an imitation of 24, which the deuteronomists nevertheless have left in the book besides their own production. 24,31 is a deut. hyphen, leading over to the deuteronomistic Book of Judges<sup>6</sup>). Other supposed deut. elements are enumerated in *Noth's* commentary.

While criticism of the older type agreed that there are considerable P-elements in the book<sup>7</sup>), *Noth*, followed by *Engnell*, reduces this material rather much, while *Mowinkel* ascribes a great deal of the second part of the book to P.<sup>8</sup>).

It is possible that these more recent considerations concerning *Jos.* make its structure more intelligible. But so much must be maintained that the stylistic discrepancies and mutual contradictions must not and cannot be slurred over. *Noth's* analysis makes the picture of the text just as motley as that of older criticism. Here too we must attest the truth of *von Rad's* words about the "shapelessness" of the Hexateuch, which is not understood until the original elements have been singled out through a minute analysis. As they stand now the narratives are often quite obscure. A description as that given in ch. 3 of the crossing of the Jordan cannot be an original unity, just as the end of the story of the visit to Rahab by the spies cannot have been preserved in its original form as a unity (ch. 2). In the last case the verses 17-21 in a most embarrassing way appear post festum, which is slurred over in *Noth's* commentary through the assumption that something has been lost. In the story of the fall of Jericho *Noth* points out a thoroughgoing editing (ch. 6), but he will not admit that these elements are remnants of a parallel

<sup>1</sup>) op. cit., p. 292.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. below, p. 89 f.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Möhlenbrink*, p. 267.

<sup>4</sup>) *von Rad*, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem...* p. 68.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. *Noth's* commentary.

<sup>6</sup>) *Rudolph*, op. cit. pp. 240 ff.

<sup>7</sup>) *Steuernagel's* commentary, p. 196; *Eissfeldt*, p. 280; *Pfeiffer*, pp. 306 ff.

<sup>8</sup>) Above, pp. 73 ff., we have referred to the theory of *Noth*, that the Deuteronomistic Work of History (Dtr.) in continuation of Dt. had a landnama-story. And we have pointed to the signification of the parallelism between *Jos. 1-12* and *Judg. 1* in thus connection.

version. But to this must be said that the elements are very homogeneous and represent a consistently different conception of the events at the conquest of Jericho, analogous to the way in which P-elements are introduced in other passages, e.g. in the Story of the Flood. Accordingly the possibility of regarding these "glosses" as remnants of a variant of the narrative cannot be excluded. But upon the whole it seems justified to say that the Documentary Hypothesis does not give any clear solution of the problems attached to the narratives of the Book of Joshua.

Moreover we must realize that the understanding of the relations between the strata of the Pentateuch, which according to *Alt* and *Noth* is the most probable, is of importance for the understanding of the following books of the Bible. We cannot be sure that it is right to presuppose that eventual "sources" here are identical with JEDP. Here too independent elements may have been preserved, as in *Jos.*, perhaps not only from oral tradition, but from early literary sources. This is especially the case with the important "Succession-Story" in *Sam.* + *Kings*<sup>1)</sup>. Even if, therefore, we were able e.g. in *Sam.* to restore a clear connection of original strata, it would not be certain that these strata were to be identified with JEDP.

Like the following books, the Book of Joshua in part has been incorporated in the Deuteronomistic Work of History, which according to *Noth* began with the Book of *Deut.* As observed above the extent of deuteronomistic work in the book is disputed<sup>2)</sup>. And so is the extent of the P-elements in the book.<sup>3)</sup>

Among the older commentaries, *Dillmann's* must be remembered. The modern commentary is that of *Noth* (2nd ed.).

## THE BOOK OF JUDGES

### Name and Contents.

The Hebrew and the Greek title of the book (*šōfeṭim, kritai*) occurs already in *Origen* and the *Talmud* (*Baba bathra* 14b, cf. also *Ecclus.* 46,11 and *Philo*, *De confusione ling.* 26,1). It is taken from the main contents of the book. In Hebrew the word "to judge" (*šft*) not only denotes "to settle a dispute", but also the power of the ruler to maintain justice, not only for the individual, but above all for the people. "They counselled the people and gained the victory"<sup>4)</sup>. The word, like the root *šdk*, has a distinct note of a *saving*, libe-

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 91 f.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet* I, pp. 235 ff.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. above, p. 82 f.

<sup>4)</sup> *Johs. Pedersen*, *Israel I-II*, p. 216.

rating activity of the leader of the nation and of God. The title corresponds to the *sufetim* of Phenicia and the *sufetes* of Carthage, akin to the Roman consuls. But "The Minor Judges" (10,1ff., 12,7ff.) are perhaps a sort of real »judges« with a function in the early amphictyony of Israel<sup>1</sup>).

The Talmud attributes the book to *Samuel*. But this cannot outweigh the fact that the book contains much material later than this great leader and has attained its present shape through the common deuteronomistic editorial work and later adaptation.

It has 21 chapters. 1,1-2,5 is generally called the "introduction". As mentioned above it is a description of the *conquest of Palestine* parallel to the Book of Jos. The *history of the Judges* we find in 2,6-16,31. Chs. 17- 18 and 19-21 are generally called "*additions*". They tell the story of the migration of the tribe of *Dan* and the foundation of the sanctuary at Dan, and of the "amphictyonic war" against Benjamin.

### Composition.

The nucleus of the book is 2,6-16,31. It is introduced by a *historico-philosophical reflection*, the main features of which are repeated in abridged form at the beginning of the stories of each of the so-called "*great judges*" (*Othniel*, *Ehud*, *Deborah* and *Barak* (taken as one), *Gideon*, *Jephthah*, and *Samson*), but not at the notes of the "*minor judges*" (*Shamgar*, *Tola*, *Jair*, *Ibzan*, *Elon*, and *Abdon*), and not in connection with the *Abimelech*-story in ch. 9. These interpretations of history are placed as *framework* around the stories of the individual ("great") judges. We are told that Israel betrayed Yahweh and worshipped false gods and so incurred Divine punishment, consisting in enemy invasion and oppression. This caused the repentance of the people, and so Yahweh called forth a "judge" to save the people from their enemies. After the story of the liberation follows a concluding note to the effect that the "judge" "judged", i. e. reigned over the people for so and so many years. After his death - we are told - the people fell back to their old sins, and the story repeats itself. These history-interpreting elements, which from obvious causes are called "the framework", are clearly *deuteronomistic*, these parts of the book belonging to the Deuteronomistic Work of History (Dtr.). It is proved through their linguistic character and the view of history as a pragmatic whole, governed by the strict principle of Divine retributive justice.

Characteristically different from the framework are the *stories* set in this frame, the narratives of the "great judges". While the framework regards the judges as rulers over all Israel, following one another chronologically, the heroes of the old *hero-legends* are *local chiefs*, leading one or a couple of

<sup>1</sup>) cf. Noth, Bertholet-Festschrift (1950). The note on *Shamgar* (3,31) is more akin to the Samson-legends than to the sections on the other "Minor Judges".



tribes. Only the "*Song of Deborah*", (ch. 5)<sup>1)</sup>, the oldest document of the book and perhaps of the entire Bible, says that *all Israel* was called out for war, but not all did their duty. But the Israel of ch. 5 is not the Israel of the framework, Judah, Simeon, and Levi being unknown to the song, and Manasseh and Gad being replaced by Machir and Gilead. The stories know no chronological sequence of the events, and they do not express the thought that the distress of the tribes was always punishment for sin. 8,18 expressly states that Gideon's motive for his war was not a call from God to deliver the people, but his duty of blood-revenge for the slaughter of his kinsmen. The Song of Deborah does not sound one single note of consciousness of sin on behalf of the whole people, but only rebukes the sin of single members of the tribal league not being obedient to the call to war against the oppressors.

By the combination of the two elements, the framework and the old hero-legends, 2,6-16,31, appears to be a *Deuteronomistic Book of Judges*, continuing Jos. 24,28 and repeating Jos. 24,29 ff. in such a manner that it becomes clear, that here we have a connecting link, joining it to the Deuteronomistic Work of History. This connection has been broken by *Judg.* 1,1-2,5.

This interruption is introduced by the words, "Now after the death of Joshua." This is obviously a redactional note which is completely meaningless, the following being, as often pointed out, a parallel to the "Landnama"-description of the Book of Jos., from which it is different in a very characteristic manner. Here it is not the united tribes under Joshua's leadership who conquer the land, but single tribes, under the guidance of the oracle of Yahweh (1,2), enter the country and conquer, but only in part, their territories. And just as the section began with a redactional remark, so it ends with an addition of the same kind (2,1-5), a deuteronomistic section expressing Yahweh's anger, because the Canaanites were not completely exterminated. The introductory and the concluding words clearly prove that the section has been incorporated in the deuteronomistic work, but re-interpreted as a description of the situation not during, but after the immigration.

As a similar feature we probably have to understand the "additions" in 17-21.

Very widely accepted is the theory that the latter sections belonged to a *pre-deuteronomistic Book of Judges*, but were omitted by the Deuteronomist together with the scandalous end of Samson's life (ch. 16). It is pointed out that the deuteronomistic framework-note is found both in 15,20 and 16,31<sup>2)</sup>, the repetition being due to a later re-incorporation of ch. 16 in the book together with the "additions". But this "subtraction- and addition-

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 138 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel* (1890), p. 133.

theory", which supposes that R<sup>d</sup> should have expelled great parts of the original Book of Judges, inter alia also the Abimelech-story of ch. 9, is very improbable. There is no probable explanation, why a later Jew should re-incorporate those scandalous stories again, after they had been condemned and done away with. Later Jewish times were increasingly interested in idealizing the ancient days<sup>1</sup>).

The "additions" are better explained, when we remember that the Deuteronomistic Work of History is not concluded by Judg., but is continued in the Books of Samuel and Kings. In this connection the "scandalous stories" in 16 and 17-21 may be understood as a *preparatory description of the distress under the Philistine oppression*, by Dtr. considered a punishment for the continuous defection of the people during the time of the judges. In like manner we must regard ch. 9 where the framework is absent.

10,1-5 and 12,7-15, dealing with "*minor judges*" are mostly regarded in a different way. We are only told that they ruled so and so long, and in some places some anecdotal note is added. That they break the *chronological plan* of the book has been denied by Noth, a with good arguments.

The Deuteronomistic Work of History according to 1 Kings 6,1 holds that 480 years elapsed from the exodus from Egypt to the building of the temple in the 4th year of Solomon's reign. But the sum total of the years of "rulers" and the times of oppression in Judg. is 410. This does not give room for the wanderings in the wilderness (40 years), the time of Eli (1 Sam. 4,18:40 years, LXX, 20 years), David (1 Kings 2,11, 40 years), and the first three years of Solomon, together 123 years. And then there also should be room for the time of Joshua, Samuel, and Saul, the years of whom we do not know. We would thus attain 533 (LXX, 513) + x + y + z years, and not the 480 years of 1 Kings 6,1. If we reckon the time of the Philistine oppression (40 years) as identical with the time of Samson and Eli (20 + 20), and deduct these 40 and the years of the "minor judges" (73) from 513 (LXX), we get 400 years left, and then we have 80 years to distribute between Joshua, Saul and Samuel. But Noth offers another explanation in the assumption of a system of 40-year periods in the Deut. History, which fits tolerably well into the scheme of 1 Kings 6,1.

The Deuteronomistic Work has also been furnished with other *late addimenta*, of which especially many are found in 20-21, where most critics assume a strong, late editing process<sup>2</sup>).

*Pre-deuteronomistic* material accordingly is found in ch. 1, the legends of all judges, and the main stem of the 17-21. But this older material is *not homogeneous*. It is evident that ch. 4 has been contaminated with Jos. 11. This

<sup>1</sup>) Michelet, in the Norwegian translation, MMM II, p. 75 f.; cf. Eissfeldt, p. 300, contrary to Mowinkel, MMM II, pp. 447 ff., Pfeiffer, p. 337.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. Pfeiffer, p. 337, referring to W. R. Arnold, Ephod and Ark, p. 101.

follows from the description in the old song in ch. 5. The Gideon-stories too contain doublets pointing to different strata. The names of the chiefs of Midian are given differently in 7,25 and 8,55ff. The difference between ch. 6 and 8,18ff. has been pointed out above. The main stem of the Jephthah-stories deals with a war with the Ammonites, but 11,12-28 talks of the Moabites; only in the fringes of the section there is some "infection" from the Ammonite stratum. In 17-18 many parallels have led commentators to assume *two sources*. But nowhere the picture is clear enough to recommend a sure separation of the stories. By analogy from the Pentateuch and the Books of Sam. the hypothesis of a separation – not of "documents", but – of different strata of traditions, belonging to different "schools" of story tellers, is not unjustified.<sup>1)</sup> But to take the step forward to attribute such strata to J and E, as it is done by the older school of literary criticism, of late especially by Hölscher<sup>2)</sup>, I cannot find certain. In continuation of the theories concerning Joshua one might suppose that several collections of legends, both orally transmitted and in early written form, have been at hand, and have been added to the old "sources", after their proper scopus in the story of the conquest of Palestine, and that these strata have been woven together already before they were taken up into the Deuteronomistic Work. That the material of Judg. 1 is earlier than J has been made out convincingly by Rudolph<sup>3)</sup>. This chapter has formed a culmination of the "history of salvation", parallel to Jos., but without his person as central character in the drama.

Of early material besides the ancient hero-legends the book contains the important *hymn in ch. 5*, the "*Song of Deborah*", and the likewise historically important "*Fable of Jotham*" in 9,7-15.

The *Deuteronomistic Work* used the old material, which must have been joined together in pre-deuteronomistic times, in its description of Israel's constant inclination to unfaithfulness, which yielded the background for the final catastrophe in 587. Still later are the editorial notes, dispersed over the work, which are thought to be akin to P.

A couple of passages seem to give hint of a *dating* of the material. 18,30 shows that the narrative got its present form after the deportation to either

<sup>1)</sup> Concerning the *Documentary Hypothesis* cf. Budde's work, quoted p. 88, n. 1 and his commentary (1902); Eissfeldt, *Die Quellen des Richterbuches* (1925); the Introductions of Oesterley and Robinson and of Pfeiffer.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. above, p. 18, n. 1; and see also Pfeiffer. The work is, from the premises of the literary school, done with methodical virtuosity, and much is still to be learned from those scholars.

<sup>3)</sup> *Der Elohist von Ex. bis Jos.* p. 271 f.



Assyria or Babylon (721 or 587). And a section like 6,25-34 clearly points to a period, characterized by an especially acute contest with Baal-worship, presumably the time of Elijah.

Among the *commentaries*, outside the usual works in the well-known series, I refer to Burney's (1920). Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (1943). *Geschichte Israels* (1950), p. 88. – On the *Chronology* cf. Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua* (1950), esp. pp. 86ff.

## THE BOOK OF SAMUEL

### Name and Contents.

According to the Hebrew Canon this part of the Deuteronomistic Work only comprises one book. Correspondingly there also is only *one massora finalis* to the Books of Samuel<sup>1)</sup>. The partition does not appear before the time of the LXX, where we find Samuel and Kings enumerated as 1, 2, 3, 4, "Books of the Kingdoms", *Basileiôn a', b', g', d'*. From the LXX the partition passed into the *Vulgate*. But here the name *libri regum*, influenced by the Hebrew, gradually took the place of the original *libri regnorum*. Finally, Bomberg's edition from 1517<sup>2)</sup> introduced the partition in the Hebrew text, but as 1-2 Sam. and 1-2 Kings. But it occurs earlier, in a manuscript from 1448<sup>3)</sup>.

The Hebrew name of the book is connected with the tradition that *Samuel* was the author of Judg. and Sam. The main part of the book narrates events after the death of Samuel, but tradition (*Baba bathra* 15a) accounts for this by assuming that this material was supplied by "the seer Gad and the prophet Nathan". This information rests upon 1 Chron. 29,29-30.

The two books have 31 and 24 chapters. The contents are easily surveyed. 1 Sam. 1-7 deals with *Samuel*, 8-15 with *Samuel* and *Saul*, 16-31 with *Saul* and *David*. 2 Sam. contains *David's* history. 1-4 relates his connections with the successor of *Saul*, 5-24 the principal events of his reign. This story is continued in 1 Kings 1-2 by the description of the accession of *David's* successor and the report of *David's* death. Contents accordingly prove that LXX's title for the four books (Sam.-Kings) is more appropriate than that of the Masoretes<sup>4)</sup>.

### Composition.

As always in the historical books it also here is evident that Sam. is not the work of one author.

The book itself in a couple of places quotes *sources* used by the compiler.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. I, pp. 48, and 52.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. I, p. 58.

<sup>3)</sup> vol. I, p. 48.

<sup>4)</sup> Oesterley and Robinson, Introduction. p. 88.

2 Sam. 1,18 mentions the *Book of Jashar* (cf. Jos. 10), and 1 Sam. 10,25 refers to a "law of the king".

The *history of interpretation* follows the same lines as in the case of the Pentateuch and Jos.-Judg. A *Documentary Theory* is evolved during the 19th century especially by *Thenius*<sup>1)</sup> and *Wellhausen*<sup>2)</sup>. *Karl Budde*<sup>3)</sup> determined the outlook of scholars through his attempt to show that the sources found were identical with *J* and *E*, and that the deuteronomistic redaction had omitted great parts of the pre-deuteronomistic Book of Samuel (1 Sam. 15; 2 Sam. 9-24; 1 Kings 1-2, 1-9 and 13-46 (in part)). In connection with this, deuteronomistic framework is believed to have been introduced. But as in the case of Judg.<sup>4)</sup> the condemned sections are assumed to have been re-introduced later, only in wrong places, which explains that 2 Sam. 21,1-14 + 2 Sam. 24 now stand outside the chronology of David's life and break the connection between 2 Sam. 20 and 1 Kings. 1. Originally this section stood before ch. 9.

Against this view the commentary of *Gressmann* (in *Schriften des Alten Testaments*) is mainly interested in the traditions of the individual legends. But the common Documentary Hypothesis has held the field till our times in different forms.<sup>5)</sup>

A work of lasting importance is *S. R. Driver's* Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, 2nd ed. 1913 - a model work in the field of textual criticism.

A work of special interest from our times is the important monograph of *L. Rost*, *Die Ueberlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids* (1926). He rejects the theory of two "documents" woven into one another, but assumes two sources placed in continuance of one another, a) The Story of Succession, the nucleus of which is 2 Sam. 13-20 + 1 Kings 1-2, with its introductory story in 1 Sam. 4-6, 2 Sam. 6; 7; 9; 10,1-12,31; and b) a description of David persecuted by Saul and his victory, 1 Sam. 23,1-13; 27,1-28,2; 29,1-30,26; 2 Sam. 1,1; 2,4a; 3,20-39; 31-37; 4,1a,5-12; 5,3,17-25 (and 8?), attributed to David's priest Abiathar (to whom the History of Succession is commonly ascribed by other scholars).<sup>6)</sup> - *Rost's* ideas are similar to those of *Alt's* school, especially *Noth's* views on Joshua<sup>7)</sup>.

*Auerbach*, *Wüste und gelobtes Land* (1932), pp. 22-33, also starts from the nucleus of the Succession-History in 2 Sam. 13-20 + 1 Kings 1-2, which he in adhesion to *Duhm* and *Budde* regards as the work of Abiathar, and works backwards to find a connection with the Yahwist<sup>8)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> Commentary 1842, 3rd ed. 1898 by *Löhr*.

<sup>2)</sup> Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher.

<sup>3)</sup> Die Bücher Richter und Samuel (1890), and his commentary (1902).

<sup>4)</sup> cf. p. 88.

<sup>5)</sup> See e.g. *Oesterley and Robinson*, *Eissfeldt* (also his special monograph *Die Komposition der Samuelbücher* (1931)), and *Pfeiffer*.

<sup>6)</sup> Conc. the relations between *Rost's* theory and e.g. *Budde's*, see *Eissfeldt*, p. 149. Note also the plausible theory of *Th. C. Vriezen* in the article quoted below, p. 93, n. 5., that the author is *Zabud*, son of *Nathan* the prophet (1 Kings 4,5).

<sup>7)</sup> cf. *Alt's* remarks, *Werden und Wesen des AT's*, ed. by *Volz, Stummer and Hempel*, p. 15.

<sup>8)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, pp. 303 ff. and 147 ff.

The common Documentary Hypothesis is advocated with great skill by *Hölscher* in *Die Anfänge der Hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung*<sup>1)</sup>. He traces the Yahwist down to the disruption of Solomon's kingdom (1 Kings 12).

The fundamental basis for the examination of the Books of Samuel must be the complex 2 Sam. 9-20 + 1 Kings 1-2. It only contains very few, quite obvious additions. Beside this story stands the complex 1 Sam. 1-15, where we obviously have two different descriptions of the origins of Hebrew kingship, one (chs. 7-8 and 12) inimical to kingship, which is regarded as defection on the part of the people towards Yahweh and only granted as a concession to the sinfulness of the people, as expression of Yahweh's forbearance; another (the main part of 9-11), which regards kingship as instituted by Yahweh as a benefit to the people. Perhaps ch. 11 is a special tradition, describing Saul in the common picture of the "Judges", as given in the old legends. Here, accordingly, a separation of "sources" or "strata" seems justified. The same is the case in the following chapters. 1 Sam. 10,11 and 19,24 contain two different accounts for the origin of the proverb of "Saul inter prophetas". According to 1 Sam. 16,14-23 David, an expert warrior and musician, obviously a grown up man, is brought to the melancholy king Saul to cheer him. But in the following story 17,1-18,2 the boy David comes to Saul for the first time (v. 55). In ch. 20 there is a series of doublets, giving two descriptions of David's escape from Saul. Twice we are told of his desertion to the Philistines (21,11-16 and 27,1 ff.), twice of the treason of the Ziphites (23,19-28 and 26,1 ff.). There are two contradictory stories concerning the death of Goliath (1 Sam. 17 and 2 Sam. 21,19), and also contradictory information concerning the children of Absalom (2 Sam. 14,27 and 18,18). We get two descriptions of the episode, where David spared the life of Saul (1 Sam. 25 and 26), two of Saul being rejected by Yahweh (13,7b-15 and 15), and likewise the prediction of the fall of the house of Eli is reported twice (1 Sam. 2,27-36 and ch. 3). Two different accounts are given concerning the circumstances at the death of Saul (1 Sam. 31 and 2 Sam. 1).

If this should be developed into a real "Hypothesis of Strata" it would be necessary - as in the Pentateuch<sup>2)</sup> - to find "constants" combining the stories, and we should be able to see a fairly obvious connection between the stories. This cannot be done completely. But nevertheless "constants" are not lacking. It is e.g. peculiar, in the two traditions of the origins of the monarchy in 1 Sam. 7-15, that one of them (9-10,16 and 11) combined the institution of kingship with *Gilgal*, the other (7-8 + 15) with *Mizpah*. And fairly well-

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 18 n. 1.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 26 f.



connected series of stories can with great probability be reconstructed in 1 Sam.<sup>1)</sup> – Accordingly I think it probable that 1 Sam. can be regarded as combined of at least two main strings.

2 Sam. shows in the “History of Succession” a formal parallel to the great complex of “landnama-traditions” in Jos. *The History of Succession is the scopus of the Books of Sam.* A separation of “documents” is very problematic here, even if it is quite obvious that 2 Sam. 7 is of another “literary” kin than the old hero-legend or the History of Succession<sup>2)</sup>. It is later theological literature<sup>3)</sup>. 2 Sam. 21,1–14 originally stood before 9,1. The History of Succession is interrupted by the “additamenta” 21–24, of which ch. 22 (Ps. 18) and “The Last Words of David” (23) in the composition correspond to the “Blessings” of Jacob and Moses and the “Song of Moses” in the Pentateuch. 20,23–26 is identical with 8,16–18, where it would be in its right place. The same must be said of 21,15–22, which belongs to the anecdotes from the Philistine wars in 5,14ff, maybe also 23,8–38. 24 perhaps originally stood after 6.

Sam. therefore seems to have come into existence roughly in this manner. A couple of strings of stories in 1 Sam. 1–2 Sam. 8 lead up to a description of David’s life as king in Jerusalem, culminating in the designation of the heir to the throne. This History of Succession – perhaps Israel’s best told story – has presumably existed in written form already shortly after the events<sup>4)</sup>. The introductory strata are later, but have incorporated old material, e.g. David’s two funeral dirges (2 Sam. 1 and 3), and different lists (1 Sam. 14,49–51; 2 Sam. 8,16–18; 3,2–5 and 5,13–15). Inside the strata perhaps other material than the History of Succession has been taken over in written form, e.g. the humorous stories of the adventures of the Ark (1 Sam. 4–6, 2 Sam. 6), the stories of David’s relations with Ishbaal et. al. in 2 Sam. 2–6 and 8, perhaps also something of the “Saul–Samuel–complex”<sup>5)</sup>. In the stories of the Ark + the History of Succession combined with Ps. 132 I presume a cultic background, giving evidence of cultic measures taken by David to secure his kingdom in connection with the impressive experiences of the people at the liberation from Philistine oppression<sup>6)</sup>. Probably a large part of the material

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, pp. 306ff., where I only must make reservations concerning the too confident attribution of the strata to J and E.

<sup>2)</sup> 2 Sam. 7 has been admirably analysed on modern traditio-historical lines by *Mowinkel* in the Lindblom Anniversary Volume of *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1947.

<sup>3)</sup> This is also the result of *Mowinkel*’s analysis, op. cit., p. 228f.

<sup>4)</sup> *Rost*, p. 127, cf. also the important article of *Th. C. Vriezen*, in *Orientalia Neerlandica* 1948, pp. 167ff, (please read not only the French Summary!).

<sup>5)</sup> cf. *Ivar Hylander*, *Der literarische Samuel–Saul–Komplex* (Uppsala 1932).

<sup>6)</sup> cf. my paper in *JBL* 1948.

in Sam. belongs to circles, inspired by David in his efforts to found a dynasty in Palestine and neighbouring lands. These circles have formed the "mythus" and its accompanying rites, on which rests the story now told in the epic of David.

The two introductory strata – whether they continue J and E I am not quite sure – stand in programmatic controversy against one another. The manner in which they have been combined is not unhappily compared by Pfeiffer<sup>1)</sup> to the way in which P of Genesis is joined to the earlier material as a sort of supplement. The way in which the later source describing the origins of kingship in Israel contrasts with the old stories of the earlier stratum shows that it represents "a deliberate attempt to correct the early history, which faithfully described conditions of an earlier day shocking to later generations, and to bring it into harmony with the theocratic conception of the state..."

Further it must be stated that the later source is very much related to the work in which the old material was incorporated at a later date, the Deuteronomistic Work of History. The *deuteronomistic editing* is not so conspicuous in Sam. as in Judg. and Kings. There are perhaps some "framework-notes" in 1 Sam. 4,18b (cf. Judg.), 13,1 (cf. Kings), 2 Sam. 2,10a-11 (cf. Kings), 5,4-5 (cf. Kings), perhaps also some deut. additions in 2 Sam. 7. – 1 Sam. 10,25b-27 and 11,12-14, which attempt to reconcile the contradictory contexts 10,17ff. and 11, probably show that it is not the deuteronomist who has united the two strings. – Later redactional elements we also find in 6,15; 7,3,4,15. That the first of these passages is deuteronomistic, may be doubtful. This way of introducing the Levites seems to belong to circles related to P<sup>2)</sup>.

The *poetical* pieces, found in some of the stories, are judged differently by scholars. David's two funeral dirges, 2 Sam. 1 and 3, are often considered genuine<sup>3)</sup>. His thanksgiving-psalm (2 Sam. 22) is a common national, royal psalm, which cannot date from his days.<sup>4)</sup> The song of Hannah (1 Sam. 2) is likewise a royal psalm (v. 10) but has no connection with Hannah and her situation<sup>5)</sup>. "David's last words", 2 Sam. 23, is a prophetic oracle, formed on

<sup>1)</sup> p. 364.

<sup>2)</sup> Wellhausen, Composition, p. 239, cf. Budde, ad loc. – On the relations between 1 Sam. 7-8 + 12 and 15 and deuteronomism, see my Die josianische Reform, pp. 88ff.; on 13,7b-14, ibid. p. 88; and on 1 Sam. 2,27-36, which cannot be reckoned to the deut. sections, my Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie, pp. 36ff.

<sup>3)</sup> Pfeiffer, p. 351f.; vol. I, pp. 135f.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. the commentaries.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 163.

the pattern known from wisdom literature (cf. also Pss. 1 and 112), the contrast between the pious and the godless.<sup>1)</sup>

The *text* of the Books of Samuel is very badly preserved, but it may be reconstructed fairly well on the basis of parallel texts of Chron. and the LXX.

S. R. Driver, Notes on the Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel (1913); P. A. H. de Boer, Research into the Text of 1 Sam. I–XVI (1938); Oudtestamentische Studiën I (1942), VI (1949).

## THE BOOK OF KINGS

### Name and Contents.

The Hebrew name of the book is *m<sup>e</sup>lakim*, “Kings”. Originally there was only one book, as in the case of Sam., which is continued in Kings, as noted above, where mention also was made of the name “3rd and 4th Books of the kingdoms”. The present partition is arbitrary, the History of Succession being interrupted.<sup>2)</sup>

The Hebrew title is a parallel to “Judges”. The author of the *Deuteronomistic Work of History* has divided his material according to *periods of history*: The fundamental revelation of God in the time of Moses, the age of immigration under Joshua, the time of apostasy during the age of the “judges”, the liberation from the Philistine oppression and the Davidic time of greatness, the dominating figure of which according to Dtr. is *Samuel*. Against his own inclinations, on account of Yahweh’s concession to the sinful wish of the people *Samuel* institutes kingship, which already shows its bad fruits during the reign of Solomon, while the history of David, as given in the “History of Succession”, was capable of an interpretation according to the law of the king in Deut. 17, especially as the story was interpreted through the seventh chapter of 2 Sam. The last period of the work is covered by the Book of Kings demonstrating how the monarchy gradually led to the destruction of Israel and Judah, in spite of the attempts of a few good kings to put a stop to the disobedience of the people towards God. Only the very last lines of 2 Kings allow a ray of hope to break through in the narrative of the release of king Jehoiachin.

So the title of the book covers its contents quite well. It gives *the history of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah from David’s death until the exile in Babylon*.

The first book has 22 chapters, the second 25. From the exile nothing is told except the note concerning the release of Jehoiachin in 561. The story of the two kingdoms is told *synchronistically*, the kings of Judah being dated in relation to the kings of Israel and vice versa.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 141 and 174.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 92.



### The traditional Authorship, and the Structure of the Book.

According to *Baba bathra 15a* the Book has been written by the prophet *Jeremiah*. This tradition cannot be contested by reference to the composite character of the book. Jeremiah lived long enough to have used different documents. But presumably he did not live long enough to have finished the book. We do not know the date of his death. But being of nearly the same age as king Josiah (born ca. 648) he would have to attain the age of nearly 90 years in order to relate events from the year 561 (cf. above). But it is decisive that the traditional information in *Baba bathra* concerning authors of the books is not reliable in most other cases. Therefore no ground can be given to accept it a priori in this case. A conclusion from *posse* to *esse* is always prohibited.

As in *Judg.* there is a very distinct *framework* to the history of the different kings. In the case of the kings of *Judah* the form of the framework is as follows. "In the *n*th year of NN king of Israel began NN the son of NN the king of Judah to reign. N years old was he when he began to reign and he reigned *n* years in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was NN from" – then follows the history of his reign according to the sources used by the historian, and the conclusion runs, "and the rest of his acts, and all that he did, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah? So he slept with his fathers, and they buried him with his fathers in the City of David, and NN his son reigned in his stead". The framework to the stories of the kings of the *Northern kingdom* is a little shorter. We are not told the names of their mothers, nor the age of the kings at their ascension to the throne. But in both forms of the framework we find judgment passed upon the kings by the author. Only *Hezekiah* and *Josiah* are praised unconditionally, the other kings of Judah are either absolutely rebuked, e.g. for idolatry, or the praise of their loyalty to Yahweh's law is limited by the information that they did not abolish the *bamoth*, "the high places", and tolerated sacrifice there. Concerning the kings of Israel we are told that they "departed not from the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin".

This polemic attitude towards "the high places" and the unconditional praise of the two kings who abolished it betrays the *Deuteronomist* judging the kings according to the claim of centralisation in Dt. 12. Also outside the framework we find deuteronomistic passages, e.g. the great prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple at Jerusalem (1 Kings 8), and also in the concluding meditations upon the fate of the Northern kingdom (2 Kings 17) and the corresponding section on Judah (2 Kings. 23,27-27; 24,2-4).

Some scholars also assume that the whole end of the history of Judah is written by the Deuteronomist(s), while e.g. *Hölscher* and *Mowinkel* are inclined to regard this part of the work as coming from the circles of *E*.

As we have noticed, the concluding formula of the framework at least in some cases contains a reference to other reports of the acts of the king and all that he did. Here *sources* are made known to which readers may turn if they want further information concerning the king in question. Such sources are "The book of the acts of Solomon," (1 Kings 11,41), "The book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel" (14,19 etc. until 2 Kings 15,31 – the last king of Israel, Hosea, having no concluding formula), "The book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah" (1 Kings 14,29 until 2 Kings 24,5). No such note is given concerning the two last kings and Hezekiah.

Accordingly the author knows more detailed stories of Israel and Judah. Whether he has used them in his own work, we do not know. But it is probable that he has made a selection from them according to his interests. In the LXX-text of 1 Kings 8,12–33 he quotes a book, "The Book of Songs", which is perhaps a corruption for "The Book of Jashar" (cf. Jos. 10,13) (reading *hjsr* for *hšir*). The other sources mentioned seem to be records of the kings concerning their building works and their wars (1 Kings 14,19; 16,20; 22,39). It is generally assumed that they had the character of *annals*, as indicated by the Hebrew expression *sefer dibrē hajjāmim*. They were registers perhaps drawn up by the so-called *mazkīr*, a "chancellor" of the king<sup>1</sup>). To this source the *stories of prophets*, *Elijah* and *Elisha* and others, hardly belonged, although 1 Kings 11,41 seem to indicate that "The book of the acts of Solomon" contained more than annalistic material<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. I, p. 248. Prof. G. R. Driver calls my attention to the articles of *de Vaux* in RB 1939, pp. 395ff. and *Begrich* in ZATW 1940, pp. 1f. Here the *mazkīr* is described by means of probable Egyptian analogies as an "announcer" or "nominator", the officer at court who introduced suppliants into the royal presence by announcing their names. But this official has many things to do. He seems to have been a sort of chief of the secret police (*Begrich*, p. 18f.), and he also had diplomatic business with foreign countries. Corresponding functions are also discernible in the Israelite material. This does not contradict the assumption that the *mazkīr* may have had something to do with the annals. One of the functions of the Egyptian parallel is also (*Begrich*, p. 18) to report on his affairs in the cabinet of the king. Similar responsibilities were assumed in the case of the *mazkīr* already by *Benzinger* in the first ed. of his *Archäologie* (p. 257f.), where the official is described as "vortragender Rat". The combination of the *mazkīr* with annals I owe to *Buhl*, *Det israelitiske Folks Historie* (7th ed. 1936 by J. C. Jacobsen), p. 232.

<sup>2</sup>) *Eissfeldt*, p. 325, cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 383: "This work was based partly on official annals and Temple chronicles, and partly on folk tales and the writer's fancy". *Engnell*, *Gamla testamentet I*, p. 240 rightly assumes that this work has been used by the author as a *writ-*

But also the material belonging to the framework seems to come from different sides and to have been combined into the present form. This is in our times used to account for the intricate problems concerning the *chronology*. We have a *double system of dates*. There is a *synchronistic* system, giving the years of accession of the kings in one kingdom in relation to the years of the king in the other country. And there is a system, giving *absolute* dates, represented by the information of the number of years of reign attained by each sovereign. These two series of numbers do not agree. Even an assumption of co-regencies, as in the case of Uzziah and Jotham in Judah in the 8th century, does not solve the difficulty. And further there are the problems raised by the divergences over against the rather certain *Assyrian* chronology<sup>1</sup>). To solve the problems scholars first started from the *absolute dates* and rejected the synchronisms as later systematization. But the discovery of synchronistic Assyrian and Babylonian king-lists dating back to the 12th century<sup>2</sup>) made this assumption uncertain. Renewed investigations seem to prove that there is also reliable material in the *synchronistic* information. The discrepancies are now generally solved by the assumption that the author(s) of the framework have used different systems (according to *Begrich* 5 systems which have been mixed up). But moreover real errors both in the synchronistic and the absolute dates are assumed<sup>3</sup>).

The framework being deuteronomistic and judging the kings on the basis of Dt. 12, the promulgation of which is described in chs. 22–33 of 2 Kings, the author(s) of the framework can hardly have written long before 621, the year of the deuteronomistic reform. This is the first indication for a dating of the book, a terminus a quo. 2 Kings 25,27–30 gives another terminus a quo, the year 561, the release from prison of King Jehoiachin. But it is a question to be taken seriously, whether the latest part of the book has not been added, the latter terminus only applying to the end of the work. For 2 Kings 22,20, promising Josiah a death in peace, cannot have known his death

ten book. The word *sefer* suffices to indicate it. *Engnell's* translation of the Hebrew title, "the collection of Solomon's traditions", is a curious sticking to expressions of his strong belief in the dominant importance of oral tradition.

<sup>1</sup>) We refer to the modern Histories of Israel. <sup>2</sup>) cf. AOT, pp. 111–35, 369–61.

<sup>3</sup>) See *Begrich*, *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda und die Quellen des Rahmens der Königsbücher* (1929); *Eissfeldt*, p. 139. *Pfeiffer*, pp. 393 ff. On the Assyrian and Babylonian texts see *Pfeiffer's* important note on p. 394. Accordingly the synchronistic tablet from Asshur is not an exact parallel, because the synchronisms were not calculated, while the younger Babylonian Chronicle (from 499 B.C.) in this respect furnishes a close parallel to the Book of Kings. *Thiele*, *The mysterious numbers of the Hebrew Kings* (1951) is the modern chronological work.



after the battle of Megiddo in 609. According to this view many have assumed that a *first author*, a deuteronomist regarding the reform in 621 as the culmination of his work (cf. 23,25), must have finished his book before 609. Another deuteronomist is then assumed to have added the rest. This leads to the common assumption of a *double deuteronomistic "redaction"*, at least at the end of the book<sup>1)</sup>. Others think that 22,20 comes from an earlier source, often supposed to be *E*, finished before 609.<sup>2)</sup>

By the last reflections we have been led to regard the *material inside the framework*. We have found certain different chronological sources, and in 2 King. 22 I have noticed one of the doublets so important for the assumption of documentary hypotheses. Another I find in ch. 23<sup>3)</sup>. But it must be admitted that a general separation of sources, as that of the Pentateuchal "documents", very often rest on too weak criteria, often of a very detailed linguistic character, the weight of which does not always seem strong. Thus the many repetitions in the history of Solomon are not with certainty to be regarded as results of a combinations of documents. For the LXX proves that the text in 1 Kings. 3-11 for a long time was fluid, so that re-arrangements and additions may have been undertaken continuously.<sup>4)</sup> The *story of Solomon* has been composed of material of different kinds, such as the *edifying legends* of the dream at Gibeon and the judgement of Solomon, the latter containing an international motive<sup>5)</sup>, but also material like the *lists* of officials and the like, and *descriptions* of the temple. There also appears *deuteronomistic* elements (ch. 8 and 11,1-13). – In the subsequent parts of the book we encounter much motley material. We find *legends of prophets* (the cycles of legends dealing with *Elijah* and *Elisha* and *Isaiah*) and narratives of the kings, and among all the kinds of stories also things which like the old strata of the preceding books distinguish themselves as admirably told. Here too scholars have tried to point out repetitions and parallel stories, making it probable that we here have composite complexes. And it has been tried to prove that the assumed strata are continuations of the Pentateuchal sources.<sup>6)</sup> But we must consider this very uncertain having already in the Book of Joshua found a different way of

<sup>1)</sup> Kuenen and Wildeboer in their respective Introductions founded this theory, followed by most critics, see Pfeiffer, p. 377.

<sup>2)</sup> At least there is a double narrative in 22, one which does not know the disaster of 609, another which has a *vaticinium ex eventu* after 609 (my *Die josianische Reform*, p. 23; Eissfeldt, p. 321).

<sup>3)</sup> *Die jos. Ref.* pp. 19 ff.

<sup>4)</sup> Eissfeldt, p. 323 f.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 241.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. Eissfeldt, pp. 335 ff.

composition. A theory of continuous strata was again a possibility especially in the First Book of Samuel, and in some parts of Kings this theory also may be taken into account. As examples may, in addition to those mentioned above, be referred to the different traditions of *Hezekiah and Sennacherib* (2 Kings 18-20)<sup>1)</sup> where 18,13-16, describing the situation generally on the same lines as the reports of Sennacherib as a defeat of Hezekiah, does not go well with the Isaiah-legends in 18,17-19,36, accentuating the retreat of the Assyrian tyrant as a signal defeat. And inside these legends 18,17-19,9a is again a parallel version to 19,9b-35. The first story has its end in 19,9a + 36a-37, while the second shows a parallel conclusion in 19,35. Here one Isaiah-legend has been inserted into the ending of its parallel. It is not to be denied that a separation of sources has an a priori probability here. We probably have to acknowledge a combination of stratification theory and the situation seen in Joshua, that compilers and redactors use greater complexes already fixed in writing. And it is possible that this collection has been composed already by E or an Elohist redactor, or finally by the deuteronomistic redaction, the latter being the certain element in the history of composition of the book.

Besides we have to assume a great deal of later editing<sup>2)</sup>. Several *glosses* – and this applies to the whole Deuteronomistic Work of History – were still unknown to the Chronicler<sup>3)</sup>. *Pfeiffer* points out that some glosses betray influence from the Priestly Code.

The LXX of Kings is one of the examples which show how fluid the text of the OT has been before the canonization of the text of the Massorettes.

The Intern. Crit. Comm. vol. on Kings (by *Montgomery*) appeared 1952.

### Prophetæ posteriores.

The forms of literature have been examined in the first volume of this work. We now come to the individual prophetic books, their origin and history. We shall not deal with the religious contents of these books, e.g. not with the important question of the attitude of the pre-exilic prophets towards the sacrificial cultus in passages such as Amos 5,18-27, Is. 1,10-17, Hos. 6,6, Micah 6,6-8, Jer. 7,21-23, nor shall we deal with the problems concerning the ideas of the Messiah or the Day of Yahweh. All such questions we must refer to the History of the Religion or OT Theology.

As mentioned in vol. I, p. 193, cf. p. 105, the transmission of the books of the prophets originally was in the hands of the disciples of the prophets.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Baumgartner*, in *Symbolae... Hrozny dedicatae* III, pp. 89ff. <sup>2)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 339f., cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 412. – <sup>3)</sup> This may however be due to the fact noticed by *Gerleman* (cf. I, p. 101, n. 1).

They handed down the oracles and other poems of the master, first orally, later committed to the instruments of writing. The prophetic books are the works of the "congregation" centring around the "father" of the disciples, "the sons of the prophets". The conception of "corporate personality"<sup>1)</sup> must also be applied to the relations between the "father prophet" and his "sons". They are "one body and one spirit" (Eph. 4,4), just as the primitive Church conceived itself as the real body of its master. Therefore it will often be difficult to single out *verba ipsissima* of the "father". But this does not mean that it is impossible to know the opinions and the ideas of the master<sup>2)</sup>. It does not mean that the personal factor of religious experience and the creative part played by the great personality is to be neglected or minimized. The "congregation" of disciples must not be looked upon as an anonymous crowd that never does any creative work. But the "father" has stamped the entire circle of followers, not only the single "words", with his own character. From him comes the working motive. – Engnell in my opinion, however, accentuates this corporate idea too strongly. It is of course right that *verba ipsissima* can only in part be recovered. But on the other hand I cannot agree with him, when he argues that it is in principle wrong to look for them. First, as he himself stresses, we have traditions in the books, connecting words of the master with *concrete situations*, and this tradition has to be accepted with a high degree of a priori trust. And secondly, as he also says, we have the old, well attested means of determining the age of a prophetic word – as other works of ancient literature – by looking for *historical hints* in the words in question. In this way it is possible to establish a greater or smaller amount of "words" which with the highest degree of probability are "genuine" words of the master. On the other hand it is also possible, along the same lines, to separate *additions* coming from later ages. Consequently the "hunt for the ipsissima verba of the prophets" is not so wrong a work at all. Accordingly we therefore in the following pages keep up paragraphs on "authenticity" and "integrity", even if we have to admit that we cannot work with the same assurance in this field as Introductions of older style do. Many of these questions, too, must be treated in commentaries, if we are to get a real understanding. We stress that we are writing "Introduction" i.e., we try to give some preliminary ideas, pointing to further work by the student.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. the essay of H. Wheeler Robinson, The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality, in *Werden und Wesen des AT*, Beih. ZATW 1936, pp. 49ff.

<sup>2)</sup> To the following lines cf. the important words of Engnell, *Profetia och Tradition*, in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1947, pp. 133 ff.



The ideas of "corporate personality" among the ancient Semites have above all been described by *Johs. Pedersen*, *Israel its Life and Culture I-IV*, and by *Mowinckel*. Both scholars take their leading ideas from the conceptions of *Vilhelm Grönbech*. Cf. also *A. R. Johnson*, *The One and the Many in Israelite conception of God* (1942), and *Åke V. Ström*, *Vetekornet* (1944), esp. pp. 79ff.; cf. also the discussion between *Mowinckel* and myself in *Studia Theologica III*. – Concerning the question of "ipsissima verba" cf. *Mowinckel*, *Prophecy and Tradition* (1946), pp. 84–88. – *Widengren*, *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets* (1948). *Eissfeldt's* contribution to *The OT and Modern Study*, ed. by *Rowley* (1951). *Johs. Pedersen*, in *Studies presented to T. H. Robinson* (1950). – My article in *Norsk Teol. Tidsskrift* 1951, pp. 209ff.

## THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

### The Name of the Book.

The first book among "the latter prophets" according to the common arrangement<sup>1)</sup> takes its name from the prophet *Isaiah*, Hebr. *jēša'jah(ū)*, Gr. 'Esaías, lat. *Esaias* or (Jerome) *Isaias*, who lived in Jerusalem in the latter part of the 8th century. The name was also borne by others.<sup>2)</sup> From ch. 6,1 it seems to follow that he was called to be a prophet "in the year that king Uzziah died", about 740. We know that he was married, and it is probable that his wife also had the gift of prophecy (8,3). They had at least two sons (7,3; 8,3), to whom the prophet gave "symbolic names" expressing important ideas in his preaching. According to rabbinic tradition<sup>3)</sup> and Church Fathers, probably dependent upon it, he suffered *martyrdom* during the reign of Manasseh<sup>4)</sup>.

### The Contents.

The 66 chapters of the book are divided by the *historical section* 36–39 into two main parts, 1–25 and 40–66.

*Summary:* 1–12 are mainly directed towards the kingdom of Judah setting aside the speeches against Asshur in chs. 10,5ff. Important sections are ch. 6, the Call of the Prophet, the Immanuel-prophecy, ch. 7, the two Messianic poems, 9,1ff. and 11,1ff. The whole section 7–8 is important as a concentrated, but not exhaustive account of the work of the prophet during the Syro-Ephraemitic war (735–32). Literarily important is also the parable of the vineyard (ch. 5) and the prophet's torah concerning sacrifice, ch. 1,9–17. – 13–23 have

<sup>1)</sup> For deviations, see p. 80.

<sup>2)</sup> Concerning the form of the name and the Greek pronunciation, see the commentary of *Gesenius* (1821), p. 3, n. 1, but also *Audet*, *Journ. Theol. Stud.* 1950, pp. 146ff. On his father *Amoz* and the subsequent mistakes by Church Fathers and Rabbis, cf. *Gesenius*, p. 3f.

<sup>3)</sup> *Jebamoth* 49b, *Sanhedrin* II, 103b – cf. *Gesenius*, pp. 10ff.

<sup>4)</sup> *Ascensio Jes.* 5,11–14; *Justinus Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, *Jerome*, cf. Hebr. 10,37. The tree, in which he was killed by sawing, is shown on the South-Eastern tip of Jerusalem's Western hill.

more sections against foreign nations. 22,1-14 is directed against Jerusalem and 22,14-25 against a Jew, a royal official. Most sections here have *superscriptions*, using the word *massā*. - 24-27 is an eschatological section, very often labelled "apocalypse". Important is here the evidence of faith in resurrection of the dead in 26,19. - 28-33 *Delitzsch* has given the name "the Book of Woe". The main part is dated about 701, concerning events connected with the campaign of Sennacherib. Important sections: 28,16, the corner stone; 30,15. - 34-35 is an eschatological description of the destruction of the heathen world, especially Edom (34) and of the bliss of the new world.

After the historical section 36-36, parallel to 2 Kings 18,13-20,19, with addition of the *Psalm of Hezekiah* (38,9-20), follows the *second part of the book*, 40-66, generally divided into two parts, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 40-55, and *Trito-Isaiah*, 56-66. *Deutero-Isaiah* is a collection of poems and oracles to the people in captivity in Babylon with predictions of the fall of that city. Important are the so-called *Servant Songs* in 42,1 ff.; 49,1 ff.; 50,4 ff.; 52,13-53,12. - *Trito-Isaiah* is a mixture of promises, admonitions and threats.

### Authenticity.

According to Jewish tradition (*Baba bathra* 14b) the Book of Isaiah was not written by the prophet Isaiah, but by "the men of Hezekiah", like Prov., Cant. and Eccl., cf. Prov. 25,1. This tradition has just as little value as the other information given by the oft-named tractate. But it is of interest to notice that of the prophetic books only Jer. is regarded as authentic. The others were considered the work of "committees" ("the men of Hezekiah" and "the Great Synagogue"). But such traditions did not mean to contest "authenticity". Ecclus. 48,24-25 shows that ca. 190 B.C. the book as a whole, including the second part (40ff.), was considered to consist of words from the prophet of the time of Hezekiah.

### *Isaiah II and Isaiah I.*

This cannot be maintained any more. From Isaiah I (1-39) we first have to separate the whole second part, *Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah*. These chapters, which were first declared un-Isaianic by *Doederlein* in his commentary from 1775 (3rd. ed. 1780) and *Eichhorn* in his *Einleitung* from 1782, clearly show that their background is the time ca. 540, when *Cyrus*, who is mentioned by name in 44,28 and 45,1, fought his victorious campaign against the Babylonian empire, cf. also the allusions to the Persian king in 41,2,25; 46,11; 48,14. Through his victories the people of Israel will be delivered from the captivity and return to their country (44,28; 40,9-10; 41,27; 51,3; 52,2f; 58,12). Babylon will be conquered (46,1f; 47,1 ff.; 43,14; 44,27). To this corresponds the state of the Jews. They are a people in captivity (42,22-24; 48,20). The towns of Judah are destroyed (51,3; 64,9), Jerusalem is in ruins (52,2,9; 62,1-4;

66,9), even "old waste places" (58,12; 61,4). The temple is also destroyed (63,18; 64,10).

This situation was formerly (cf. Sir. 48,24-25) explained on the supposition that Isaiah ca. 700 spoke to the times of later generations.<sup>1)</sup>

But it is impossible to keep up this idea. An important proof of this is commonly found in the manner in which the prophet refers to the *fulfilment of former prophecies* as an assurance that the prediction of the fall of Babylon and Israel's deliverance will also be fulfilled (41,21-29; 42,9; 43,8-13; 44,8; 45,21; 46,8-12; 48). 41,2-5 shows, cf. v. 22ff., that the earlier prophecies which have now been fulfilled, had relations to the victories of Cyrus. This proof from earlier prophecies would be quite without meaning for hearers in the 8th century and is only of value to people who experience the new beginnings, the first victories of Cyrus, and who accordingly live between 546 (the victory over Croesus in Lydia) and 539 (fall of Babylon).<sup>2)</sup> But of more importance still is it that the traditional opinion is at variance with *prophetic analogy*. The prophets always spoke directly to their own times. But how could it be of any interest to the contemporaries of Isaiah of the 8th century, threatened by the aggressive imperialism of Asshur, to hear of Babylon, with which they, at least in the time of Hezekiah and Sennacherib, were on good terms, and its fall under the blows of the unknown Persian Cyrus? Further we would have to assume – if 40ff. should come from the 8th century prophet – that his prophecies had been kept secret for ca. 150 years, unknown as they are to the prophets of the 7th-6th century, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. But this assumption is so unnatural that it must prohibit itself. Is. 8,16 cannot be used to prove it. For here we do not hear the prophet speak of a sealed book, but of oral teaching given to his disciples, which

<sup>1)</sup> cf. Cheyne, *Introd. to the Book of Isaiah* (1896), p. 240f., for the history of interpretation. – Eichhorn and Doederlein have had certain forerunners. Thus, *Ibn Ezra* to 40,1 has one of his obscure allusions (cf. p. 11), from which his readers may draw their conclusions. Calvin on 44,28 mentions some *impii* who considered this passage a *vaticinium ex eventu*. The authenticity was maintained by the confessional repristination-theology (Hengstenberg etc.), but is now generally abandoned (but see Kaminka in *Rev. des Études Juives*, 1925, vol. 80 and 81, quoted by Eissfeldt).

<sup>2)</sup> There is, however, something to be noted here. The contrast between "the Old" "the New" in Deutero-Isaiah has in some places its background in the conception that the old dispensation is now gone, and a new world is beginning. That this new world is coming, and with it the deliverance of Israel, has been foretold "of old", and the beginnings are seen in the victories of Cyrus, which have been foretold by prophets. – On the notion "the Old" and "the New", see further my book *Messias-Moses redivivus-Menschensohn* (1948), pp. 54ff., and my communication to the XXI International Congress of Orientalists 1948, *Studia Theologica* I (1947); North, in *Studies presented to T. H. Robinson* (1950).



necessarily must have left traces in the collections coming from the prophets of the 7th century. On the contrary, Is. 8,16 is a proof against the Isaianic provenience of 40-66.

Besides the political situation also other arguments against authenticity of 40 ff. are used. Already the proof taken from the relations between Is. I and II and the prophecy from the intermediate period is of a *religio-historical* kind. And to this sphere also belong references to the *monotheistic teaching* which is not set forth with the same theoretical clearness in Is. I as in Is. II. Is. I as all the prophets have come far in the direction of monotheism<sup>1</sup>), but it has still its limitations. In Is. II on the other hand it appears as a continuously advocated doctrine, directed polemically against worship of images. – Further, the views concerning *foreign nations* are different. To Is. I Asshur is the world-power and the instrument of Yahweh to punish Israel (10,5 ff.). In Is. II this rôle is played by *Babylon* (47,6), even if the idea is the same, that the empire has misused its power and placed itself on the throne of God. But in addition we have in Is. II the idea of the expansion of the worship of Yahweh to the foreign nations, which has no corresponding place in the thoughts of Is. I. In Is. II it is an element from the old hymns to the enthronement-festival of Yahweh<sup>2</sup>), which has been stressed in a very emphatic manner.<sup>3</sup>) Is. II expects the punishment of Babylon, but at the same time the words are dominated by the idea of the conversion of the heathen nations, for which Israel and the prophet himself, the Servant of the Lord, are to be the instrument.<sup>4</sup>) – In connection with this we also must point to the idea of the *Messiah*, in Is. 9,1 ff. and 11,1 ff., still marked by the “imperialism” of the old royal psalms, while Is. II looks forward to a day, when the promises to David are fulfilled, without any allusion to the destruction of foreign peoples<sup>5</sup>). And in Is. I there is no parallel to the picture of the *suffering Messiah* in Is. II.<sup>6</sup>)

Finally scholars refer to *differences of language and style*. While Is. I generally

<sup>1</sup>) See Balscheit, *Alter und Aufkommen des Monotheismus in Israel* (1938), p. 117. E. Sjöberg, in *En Bok om Bibeln*, utgiven av svenska teologer (1947), p. 145; cf. Irwin, in *Frankfort, Wilson, Jacobsen, and Irwin, The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man* (1946), pp. 224 ff.

<sup>2</sup>) Sjöberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 124 and 145. – To assume that the enthronement-psalms are dependent upon Is. II (Snaith, *Studies in Psalter* (1934); *The Jewish New Year Festival* (1947) pp. 195 ff.) is completely out of date. Consequently we also should have to give Jeremiah the credit of having created the style of Psalms of Lamentation.

<sup>3</sup>) It is not certain that Is. 2.1 (Micha 4,1 ff.) is Isaianic. And Is. 19,18-25 cannot belong to the 8th century Isaiah, who does not expect the conversion of Asshur and Babylon but (cf. the immediately preceding sections) their destruction.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. my paper in *Nordisk Missions-Tidsskrift* (1937), pp. 55 ff.

<sup>5</sup>) *op. cit.*, p. 59.

<sup>6</sup>) cf. also the detailed sections of *Cheyne, Introd. to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 241 ff.

bears the mark of the brief and emphatic diction of older prophecy, Is. II is more copious of language. The *hymnic* style is very characteristic in his poems, at least in the proper Deutero-Isaianic chapters (40-55).<sup>1)</sup> But there may also be referred to similarities between the two parts, even if this cannot prevent that a reader very soon will discover that broadly speaking the two sections stylistically are as different as sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels from the speeches of the Gospel of John.<sup>2)</sup>

In all that has hitherto been said it must be noted, that Is. I contains sections which are very similar to Is. II, e.g. chs. 13-14; 21,1-10, and 34-35. Of course such sections, on the same grounds as Is. 40ff., must be assigned to the later age. Here as everywhere the explicit historical background must be decisive. We have to admit a not inconsiderable amount of Deutero-Isaianic material in Is. I, - as in the other prophetic books, where we also find poems stylistically and historically akin to Deutero-Isaiah.

### *Isaiah I.*

Such sections in Is. I are - besides those already mentioned - 11,10ff.; 19,16-25; 24-27. Even if the city, the destruction of which is hailed in 25,2; 26,5; 27,10ff., cannot be identified with certainty, such a text nevertheless must be placed after the fall of Nineveh in 612<sup>3)</sup>. Also other parts of the book have been assigned to later ages, e.g. the oracles against Moab and Ammon (chs. 15-16), which as in other prophetic books are understood against the background of the attitude of these peoples towards the Jews during the catastrophe in 587; further the anti-Assyrian oracles (10,5 etc.), and above all the Messianic prophecies, notably those in 9,1ff. and 11,1ff.

These problems cannot be treated in detail here<sup>4)</sup>. I only limit myself to some general remarks, mostly concerning the principles of interpretation.

When a definitely later background is discernible, such sections of course have to be assigned to the later date. This may be suspected in 15-16<sup>5)</sup>, but it is clear in 11,10ff. Passages, which suppose the exilic background, are out of question in this connection (13-14). The anti-Assyrian pieces, which are totally rejected by e.g. *Mowinkel*<sup>6)</sup> cannot be treated all alike. That the

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 164. <sup>2)</sup> *Cheyne*, op. cit. pp. 247ff.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, pp. 363ff.; *Lindblom*, *Die Jesaja-Apokalypse* (1938), pp. 72ff. *Pfeiffer*, pp. 441ff.; *Rowley*, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1947), p. 23 f.; *H. Riesenfeld*, *The Resurrection in Ezekiel XXVII and the Dura-Europos Paintings* (Uppsala 1948), pp. 3f., 10ff.

<sup>4)</sup> I refer to my detailed commentary (1944). <sup>5)</sup> Of late I am inclined to place 15-16 before the exile. 16,5 would suit the period 597-587 very well.

<sup>6)</sup> *Profeten Jesaja* (1925), pp. 119ff.; *Jesajadisiplene* (1926), pp. 47ff.; the annotated Norwegian translation by *Michelet*, *Mowinkel*, and *Messel*, III, (1944), pp. 66ff., cf. my commentary, pp. 86ff.

prophet has expected the fall of Assyria is clear from 18,5-6. And the first Anti-Assyrian oracle, 10,5-18, is of a concreteness, which makes it difficult to abandon the testimony of tradition<sup>1</sup>). The following part of the chapter (vv. 19-26) shows so many traces of epigonism<sup>2</sup>) that they may be assigned to the circle of disciples.

The *Messianic prophecies* were generally excised from the Isaianic parts of the book and often assigned to post-exilic times<sup>3</sup>). Often this was due to the dominant idea of the pre-exilic prophets being exclusively prophets of doom. Here too we have to warn against a too summary treatment. The passages will be examined individually. 2,1 ff. cannot – as said before – be assigned with certainty to any prophet, owing to the uncertainty already in tradition. Ch. 4 is a mosaic of *clichés* from different sources, bearing the mark of epigonism. On the other hand, the two famous Messianic songs, 9,1 ff. and 11,1 ff., do not necessarily presuppose the fall of the Davidic dynasty in 586<sup>4</sup>). On the contrary, they are very clear expressions of the pre-exilic ideas of the monarchy, and – I should add to *Pedersen's* words referred to in the notes – also with a stressing of the ideas which were infringed by the unrighteous monarchs of the time of Isaiah<sup>5</sup>).

But on the other hand I should warn against a too dogmatic reaction against the idea of the pre-exilic prophets as only prophets of doom. In the very valuable and inspiring treatment of this question found in *Engnell's* works there is a tendency in this direction<sup>6</sup>). The psychological fact of “ambivalence of feelings” cannot be used to paint a picture of a prophet, spouting out an oracle of doom to the right, and then swinging his beard to the left, singing a description of Messianic bliss. To quote *Herder's* words, “Ihre Seele blüht auf wie eine Rose, wenn die Stürme vorüber sind; ihre geängstigte, vom Nebel erwachte Empfindung verkündigt sodann siebenfaches Gute”<sup>7</sup>) is a misuse, if it is used to picture the prophets in this way. The prophets are – in spite of ecstasies –

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 346. <sup>2</sup>) pointed out in my commentary.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. still *Pfeiffer's* polemic against those who “cling tenaciously to their Isaianic authorship”, p. 440. – On 6,13 see *Brownlee*, in *Vetus Testamentum* (1951), pp. 296ff.

<sup>4</sup>) See the sagacious argument in *Johs. Pedersen*, *Israel, its Life and Culture* III-IV, pp. 89ff., and especially the notes to p. 91.

<sup>5</sup>) Their pre-exilic origin is also defended by *Hammershaimb* in an article on the Immanuel-prophecy in *Studia Theologica* III. An important treatment of Isaiah 7-8 by *Nyberg* in *Illustreret Religionsleksikon* I (1949), ed. by *Aage Bentzen*, *Søren Holm*, and *N. H. Sørensen*. – *Mowinkel*, *Han som kommer* (1951), still thinks 11,1-10 post-exilic.

<sup>6</sup>) See for a summary his article on *Profetia och tradition* in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1947 (The Lindblom congratulation volume), pp. 124ff.; cf. *The Call of Isaiah* (1949).

<sup>7</sup>) *Vom Geist der ebräischen Poesie* II, p. 60.



too clear thinkers to be quite uncontrollable persons. The threats and denunciations against the people and the consoling words can hardly have been uttered in a single breath, they must belong to different situations. The question of the "authenticity" of a saying must be kept separate from the historical question of the use of the literary scheme, that words of doom in the prophetic books alternate with words of promise.

### *The problem of Trito-Isaiah.*

Is. II cannot with certainty be considered a unity. Setting aside glosses and minor additamenta we here have to deal with the problem of *Trito-Isaiah* and the original connection of the *Ebed-Yahweh* songs with Deutero-Isaiah.

The problem of Trito-Isaiah was raised by *Duhm*, when – in his commentary from 1892 – he separated Is. 56–66 as a work of a prophet different from Deutero-Isaiah.

Earlier *Bertholdt* in his *Einleitung* had assumed several authors in Is. II. But *Gesenius* and *Hitzig* had so energetically maintained the unity of the chapters that it remained uncontested. *Kuenen* attempted to prove a part of 40–66 to be written in Palestine, not in Babylon, perhaps by Deutero-Isaiah himself, perhaps by disciples. *Duhm* assumed one man to be the author of 56–66. But later scholars have tried to dissolve the section as a collection of fragments. In recent times a reaction set in in some quarters to return to the original conception of *Duhm*, especially *Elliger* tried to make good the unity of Trito-Isaiah in several books and articles<sup>1</sup>). The original connection between Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah was advocated by *Glahn*, *König* and *Torrey*<sup>2</sup>).

That the two sections are akin to one another is evident, both in respect of form and of contents, in the description of Yahweh coming to save his people and lead it home. At least the chs. 56–66 must be assigned to an author or a circle very closely related to chs. 40–55. The *punctum saliens* must be the question of *historical background*. But it is not easy to determine this factor. The poetical form often makes it difficult to make out, whether the poems describe a present reality or an expectation of some future event, e.g. the words concerning the new temple in 56,5; 63,7–64,11; 60. Consequently it becomes difficult to maintain with certainty a date before or after 520–516 B.C., the years of the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem. Not even the post-exilic origin of all pieces may be called certain. 57,7–13 reminds us

<sup>1</sup>) *Elliger*, Die Einheit des Tritojesaja (1928); Der Prophet Tritojesaja (ZATW 1931, pp. 112ff.); Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja (1935).

<sup>2</sup>) *Glahn*, Hjemkomstprofeten (1928; German edition together with *Köhler*, Der Prophet der Heimkehr (1934)), cf. also the commentary of *König* (1926) and that of C. C. *Torrey* (1928). The latter takes 34–35 into the Second Isaiah, but dates the whole complex to ca. 400, which compels him to the unmethodical erasure of the name of Cyrus.

of Ez. 16 and 23 and might well be dated before 587, cf. also 57,1-6. And in like manner 63,7-65,25 may be connected with the events of this year, just as the Book of Lamentations.<sup>1)</sup> There are many possibilities. But when both similarities and differences between 41-55 and 56-66 are taken equally into account, the scales seem to sink in favour of the theory that Trito-Isaiah comes from the disciples of Deutero-Isaiah<sup>2)</sup>. Pfeiffer<sup>3)</sup> has formulated the thesis that the purpose of Is. 56-66 is to interpret the Second Isaiah for a later generation. And broadly speaking that may be a sound conception.

### *The Servant Songs.*

Still more difficult, perhaps the most difficult in the entire Old Testament, is the so-called *Ebed-Yahweh-problem*<sup>4)</sup>. The poems called the Songs of the Servant of the Lord are 42,1 ff.; 49,1 ff.; 50,4 ff.; 52,13-53,12. The exact limitation of each poem is somewhat uncertain. There is not agreement concerning how much of the chapters belong to the poems, and some scholars divide some of the poems into separate songs.

Many divide 42,1 ff. and 52,12 ff. into two pieces each (42,1-4; 42,5-7 (or 8) and 52,13-15; 53,1-12). In like manner 49,7-12 seems to be composed of two pieces not directly belonging to 49,1-6, which is a well-defined whole, while both 7 and 8 exhibit new introductory formulas. And the connection of 50,10-11 is not generally acknowledged. There are also other passages which are so like the Servant songs that they may be reckoned among them, above all 61,1 ff. I am inclined also to find a song of the Servant in 51,9-16.

To this problem too the commentary of *Duhm* has been of decisive importance, because he separated the poems from Deutero-Isaiah. The kinship between Is. II and the Songs are – as in the case of Is. III – so great that some connection or other must be a fact.

The main question is, whether the contents of the songs are so different from that of the bulk of Deutero-Isaianic prophecy that it becomes impossible to assume the same prophet behind both complexes, and the *definition of the idea of "Servant of Yahweh" in Is. II.*

Already the history of the text proves that this idea has been understood different ways. In 42,1 LXX adds "Israel" and "Jacob" as explicatives of the idea, cf. 49,3, where many think "Israel" to be an additamentum. This proves that the Jews interpreted the poems as having the people of Israel as their subject. This use of the expression "the servant of the Lord" is found in Is. II outside the songs (41,8; 42,19; 43,10; 44,1; 45,4; 48,20). On the other

<sup>1)</sup> Concerning the latter section I especially refer to my commentary (1943).

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, pp. 383 ff.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 480.

<sup>4)</sup> C. R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* (1948) gives a comprehensive treatment of the history of interpretation and of the problems concerning the Servant Songs.

hand, in 49,6 and 50,10 the Servant seems clearly different from the people. In the first passage he has been called to lead the people home to Palestine. In the second he is presented as a person to whom the people is admonished to listen. And 53 is most naturally understood as a description of an individual. But *Eissfeldt* has drawn attention to the fact that such individual features also occur outside the songs. The Servant is addressed as an individual (41,8 ff.), and his "right hand" is mentioned (41,13), also his eyes and ears are visualized (42,12), and his creation in his mother's womb is alluded to (44,1-2). On the other hand, when *Eissfeldt* asserts that this is no qualitative, but only a quantitative difference between the Servant in the Songs and in the common Deutero-Isaianic sections, he forgets that 42,19 describes the Servant as blind and deaf, while in the Songs he is Yahweh's obedient servant, trained by God himself (42,1 ff.; 50,4 ff.). In a very inspiring, but also very one-sided article,<sup>1)</sup> *Engnell* assumes that 42,19 may be interpreted as a feature taken from the royal ideology, presumably representing the passion-aspect of the Messiah. I am not quite convinced by *Engnell's* very brief and cautious statement<sup>2)</sup>. But it seems at least obvious that in certain sections the Servant of Yahweh is described as different from the people as a whole. In earlier times therefore it was attempted to account for this and for the "collective" features by the assumption that the Servant was identified with only a *section of the people*, the pious men or the prophets, the true Israel. Others stress the individual features and consider the Servant either a *historical person*, perhaps Deutero-Isaiah himself, or an *ideal figure*. *Engnell* tries to prove that he is the *Messiah*, belonging to the Deutero-Isaianic book, which is an imitation of a liturgy for the annual festival of the enthronement of Yahweh<sup>3)</sup>. – In his great article on the subject<sup>4)</sup> *H. S. Nyberg* has given an interpretation according to my feeling with more comprehensive understanding of the many streams running into the 53rd chapter of Is. He has especially pointed out the use of the significant title "The Servant of the Lord" as applied to the cult-founder Moses, the dynasty-founder David and to Joshua (Jos. 24,29; Judg. 2,8). As parallels he further points to *Dn'l* and *Krt* in the Ras Shamra ritual texts, who are

<sup>1)</sup> Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 1945, p. 43. The article is printed in English as The 'Ebed Yahweh Songs and suffering Messiah in "Deutero-Isaiah" (Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 1948, pp. 54-93).

<sup>2)</sup> In my commentary of 1943 I have assumed that 42,19 is a gloss. But it is possible that we have here a description of the Servant, determined by the collective aspect of the Messianic idea (cf. my book *Messias-Moses redivivus-Menschensohn* (1948), p. 48).

<sup>3)</sup> This idea was briefly set forth by *R. Gyllenberg* in Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 1940, p. 87, quoted by *Engnell* in his article p. 33, n. 6 (not in the English edition, p. 6, n. 1).

<sup>4)</sup> Smärtornas man, Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 1942, pp. 5 ff.



described as primeval kings, as dynasty- and cult-founders, and called 'abd 'El. Nyberg therefore assumes that 'ebed Yahweh is a Yahwistic adaptation of a Canaanite title especially used of people of this kind. He also points out that this title in the earlier parts of the OT is only sporadically used of patriarchs of the desert type (Gen. 26,24; Num. 14,24). Of Israel it is not used before Deutero-Isaiah, of Jacob in later parts of the Books of Jer. and Ez. (30,10; 33,26; 46,27f.; Ez. 37,25). But it is used of the prophet Isaiah (Is. 20,3).

Further, Nyberg underlines that the Servant in Is. 40ff. exhibits characteristics of the type of the "patriarch". He is at the same time "individual" and "collective". He is "Israel" both in the aspect of a patriarch and a people. In him the experiences of the people are concentrated. But the figure is here more complex than anywhere else. New thoughts have taken possession of the old motives, and new experience has given them new contents.

With those ideas of Nyberg<sup>1)</sup> have combined that which I think is the truth of Sellin's rather fantastic ideas of the relations between Is. 53 and the lost tradition of the martyrdom of Moses. The Servant of Yahweh in Is. 40ff. is in a couple of passages clearly described in the rôle of a *new Moses* (49,5-6,8-12).<sup>2)</sup> and also in that of *Joshua*, as leader of the new Exodus and the new conquest of the land. And the idea of *vicarious suffering* in the Servant Songs also points back to the traditions of Moses, who was ready to give his life for his sinful people (Ex. 33,31 ff.) and made intercession for the people (Dt. 9,17-20,25-29), cf. also the traditions in Dt. 1,37; 3,26; 4,21, where Moses must bear the punishment for the people's sins with the people. This again points back to certain ideas connected with the royal ideology of the Ancient Orient<sup>3)</sup>.

And finally, with Nyberg<sup>4)</sup> I think that it must not be forgotten that the Servant is described as a *prophet*<sup>5)</sup>, and that there are features in the description which seem to presuppose "*a living model*" of the picture, and that this picture may be sought in the circles of the prophets in the exile. It is therefore an error to deny that the 'Ebed Yahweh is a *historical person*. One might as well deny the historicity of Cyrus in Is. 44-45. The "I" of the Servant Songs must be understood just as really as Cyrus. And therefore I think it most probable that we have to uphold the autobiographical theory of the Servant Songs, as it was propounded by Mowinkel in 1921<sup>6)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> Messias-Moses redivivus-Menschensohn, pp. 42-71.

<sup>2)</sup> I have pointed this out years ago in a popular book, *Jahves Tjener* (1928), cf. my commentary.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. Messias-Moses red. - Menschensohn, pp. 64ff.

<sup>4)</sup> Svensk Exeg. Årsbok 1942, p. 79f.

<sup>5)</sup> So also Mowinkel, in the Norwegian Translation of the OT, III, p. 195.

<sup>6)</sup> In his book *Der Knecht Jahwes*.

When all this is taken together, we come to the assumption that the Servant of Yahweh is not only an ideal figure of Messianic character, but also a concrete historical person, identical with the prophet. The prophet perceived in the Servant a model for his own life. Like Moses he has to identify himself with his people "for better and for worse". It may be expressed in the following way: The Servant Songs belong to the same circle as the rest of the Deutero-Isaianic poems, representing the profoundest thoughts uttered concerning the problem of suffering and concerning the task of Israel as the prophet of Yahweh to the world, expressed in one individual figure, in whom the prophet and his disciples have seen both a Messianic promise and a programme for their personal life. 'Ebed Yahweh is both the Messiah and Israel and Deutero-Isaiah and his band of disciples. And the Songs may thus be called expressions of an idea of the "imitation of Christ" in Israel<sup>1)</sup>.

Is. 51,9-16 which at the end contain characteristic allusions to the call of the prophet (ch. 49) and so in its structure reminds of Jer. 15,15-21 I am inclined to regard as belonging to the 'Ebed Yahweh-complex<sup>2)</sup>.

### The Composition of the Book.

The previous sketches have shown that we have some very disparate elements in the Book of Isaiah. For an attempt to give a list of authentic passages in 1-39 I refer to the first volume of my commentary from 1944<sup>3)</sup>.

It is very difficult to give a clear answer to the question concerning the growth of the present book. The details of the process are obscure. Some have thought that Is. I has been put together according to the same plan as that of Ez. and the LXX-form of Jer.: First threats against Judah, then against foreign nations, and finally promises. But this arrangement is not so clear as in Ez., for Is. 28-32 are to a great extent threats against Judah. Either scholars think that small and medium collections have been added to one another, or they assume that a bulk of words have been supplemented with other collections and single sentences. The book has, says *Eissfeldt*, had a long and complicated history, and sections which originally belonged together have been torn asunder, while on the other hand also interrelated elements have been kept together. 9,7-20 and 5,25-30 with the characteristic refrain must in some way or other belong together, just as the "woes" in 5,8ff. have some connection with 10,1ff<sup>4)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *North*, in *The Scottish Journal of Theology* 1950, pp. 374-379, and Appendix.

<sup>2)</sup> My book *Det Gamle Testamente, Tre Foredrag* (1929), p. 47f.

<sup>3)</sup> pp. VII-VIII. - Cf. the Appendix.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, pp. 344ff.

In recent years new points of view here as elsewhere have been propounded in connection with the deeper knowledge of the significance of *oral tradition*. Engnell's ideas have been referred to above<sup>1</sup>). As mentioned there he regards the words of Is. 40ff. as a poetical imitation of liturgies used at the annual festival of the enthronement of Yahweh. He thinks that the whole Book of Isaiah like most prophetic books must be regarded as a great collection of material, emanating from Isaianic circles of traditionists, who have carried on oral tradition from the beginning and far down through history. From these circles and lastly from the prophetic master himself comes the typical manner of arrangement, known also from other parts of the Orient, with its alternating between words of woe and words of promise<sup>2</sup>). In the different complexes the sections are arranged on the catchword-principle<sup>3</sup>). A *personal connection* between the three main parts of the book is found in the circle of disciples who handed down the Deutero-Isaianic material, and who had direct connections with the Proto-Isaianic circle of disciples. And if there is a connecting link between chs. 55 and 56, then it means that behind Trito-Isaiah stands another circle which is very strongly related to the Deutero-Isaianic. These relations between the two, perhaps three circles explain how "Deutero-Isaianic" and "Trito-Isaianic" material can be found in the "Proto-Isaianic" material and vice versa<sup>4</sup>).

The *date* of the finished book must probably be fixed on the basis of the fact that chs. 24-27 seem to be the most recent part of the book. If Lindblom is right in thinking that the "city" which is derided in this section, is *Babylon* sacked by *Xerxes* in 485, it means that the book must have been finished after this date. Ecclus. 48 (ca. 200 B.C.) knows the entire book as Isaianic, and Dan. 11-12 makes great use of it, as I have shown in my commentary

<sup>1</sup>) See Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 1945, pp. 39, cf. the English edition, pp. 12ff.; cf. also The Call of Isaiah (1949); art. Jesaja, and Jesajaboken, Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk I (1948); cf. also my article in Illustreret Religionsleksikon I (1949).

<sup>2</sup>) cf. vol. I, 258f.

<sup>3</sup>) vol. I, p. 257.

<sup>4</sup>) In this short survey of Engnell's view I have left out some special points, on which I think opinions may differ. They are discussed by Mowinkel in some places in his book Prophecy and Tradition (1946), and Engnell's answers are found in his paper Profetia och tradition in Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 1947, especially in the notes. Setting aside these points of difference I feel much inclined to accept the broad lines of his views as given above. Mowinkel's view on the composition of the book is found in his article in Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift 1943, pp. 159ff. and in the introductions in the Norwegian Translation, vol. III., cf. also his article in Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift 1946, criticizing my views on the composition of Is. 40-55.



on that book. We therefore cannot come nearer to an exact date than these two years, between ca. 480 and ca. 200 B.C. Before 100 B.C. the book must have attained its present shape, as indicated by Sir. 48, 24-25.

*Commentaries* in the current series. *Kissane* 1941-43 (Roman Catholic). My *Jesaja* I (1944) and *Jesaja* II (1943). *Buhl* (2nd ed. 1912). For *Mowinkel's* earlier views, cf. *Acta Orientalia* 1933, pp. 267ff. and *ZATW* 1931, pp. 87-112, 242-60, *Acta Or.* 1936, pp. 1 ff. Further cf. *Birkeland*, *Zum hebräischen Traditionswesen* (1938), pp. 26-41. On Is. 53 and my views concerning that chapter, I refer also to *Haandbog i Kristendomskundskab VIII* (1945), pp. 195ff. - Much valuable bibliographical and historical material is to be found in *Sidney Smith*, *Isaiah Chapters XL-LV* (Schweich Lectures 1940) (1944), cf. *Rowley* in *Journal of Theol. Studies* 1945, pp. 215ff. On the *Servant Songs* cf. also *Lindhagen*, *The Servant Motif in the Old Testament* (1950); *Lindblom*, *The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah* (1951); *Mowinkel*, *Han som kommer* (1951), ch. VII. - My article "Herrens Tjener" in *Illustreret Religionslexikon*, ed. by *Bentzen*, *Holm* and *Sve*.

The edition of the *Ethiopic text* by *Bachmann* I have not seen. On the Dead Sea manuscripts of *Isaiah*, cf. *Kahle*, *Bertholet-Festschrift* (1949); *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (1951); cf. *Appendix* to I, p. 47, l. 17. - *Brockington*, *The Greek Translator of Isaiah* (*Vetus Testamentum* 1951, pp. 23ff.).

## THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH

### The Name of the Book and the Prophet.

The book is named after the prophet *Jeremiah*. The *Hebrew* form of the name is *jirmjahū* or *jirmjah*. It is also used of other persons in the OT, as a glance at the concordance will reveal. The *Greek* transcription '*Ieremias*' is as usual the base of the *Latin* form and of the forms used in the different translations all over the world.

The prophet's home was *Anathoth*, the modern '*Anāta*, 7 km. NE of Jerusalem (I,1; II,21,23; 29,27; 32,7-9). His father *Hilkiah* was a priest (I,1: "of the priests that were in Anathoth"). It is generally assumed that he was a descendant of *David's* priest *Abiathar*, whom *Solomon* banished to the small provincial town. The prophet was unmarried, an unusual thing in Israel, which he regarded as a special burden laid upon him by the command of *Yahweh* (16,2).

The book furnishes us with very detailed information concerning the life of the prophet. It contains not only a series of *narratives* which upon the whole are a source of first importance concerning certain external circumstances in his life. But it also brings us a collection of deeply *personal poems*, mostly composed in the style of the cultic psalms of lamentation<sup>1</sup>). In these poems he expresses his reactions towards his fate in life and reveals his personal temptations and wrestling with God to be obedient to his calling as a prophet. They are therefore also a rich store of material for the understanding of

<sup>1</sup>) cf. I, p. 164, II, p. 121.

prophecy, and a book on prophecy will always be, to a great extent, a book on Jeremiah<sup>1)</sup>.

He was called to be a prophet in the 13th year of Josiah (1,2; 25,3), i.e. 626 B.C. In the record of his calling he describes himself as a *na'ar*, without the experience to make him speak confidently to his people<sup>2)</sup>. This may indicate that he must be born later than ca. 650, the date presumed by Rudolph<sup>3)</sup>. He may have been younger than king Josiah who came to the throne as an eight year old boy in 639. His last words, in ch. 44, are spoken in Egypt where he had arrived in the company of some Jewish refugees who went to that country after the murder of Gedaliah in 587. Thus he has lived to see the dramatic events from the dissolution of the Assyrian Empire after the death of Assurbanipal (626), to the fall of the Jewish state in 587, when the Neo-Babylonian Empire, after a short interval of Egyptian domination over Palestine, ending in the ignominious defeat at Charchemish in 605, definitively put an end to the political independence of the Jewish people, to be revived only for a short century in the time of the Maccabees, and in our days.

The life of Jeremiah is a martyrdom, and later ages have been deeply impressed by it and by the book. To this the legends of 2 Macc. 2,4f. and the expectation of his return at the end of the days (Mt. 16,14) give evidence, as also the traditions of his having composed several OT books, besides his own also Lam. and Kings (*Baba bathra* 15a).

Concerning the life and position of Jeremiah in the religious history of Israel we refer to the books on the History of Israel and on the History of the Religion of Israel. Besides the works mentioned above see also the detailed representation of Pfeiffer, the Introduction to Rudolph's commentary, and A. C. Welch, Jeremiah (1928)<sup>4)</sup>. On the alleged allusion to Jeremiah in the Lachish ostraca, see Winton Thomas, "The Prophet" in the Lachish Ostraca (1946).

### Contents.

The Book has 52 chapters. The order of the material is different in MT and the LXX (cf. below).

Ch. 1 gives the description of the vocation of the prophet, chs. 2–25 contain words of Jeremiah, partly dated, chs. 26–45 mostly biographical material, but also some speeches attributed to the prophet (30–33), chs. 46–51 oracles against foreign nations, while ch. 52, cf. 2 Kings 24,18–25, tells the story of Judah from 587 till 561.

<sup>1)</sup> Hertzberg, Prophet und Gott (1923), p. 10 – cf. also the fine volume of Skinner, Prophecy and Religion (1922).

<sup>2)</sup> Rudolph, in his commentary (1947), p. 5, cf. my Helgen eller Højforræder? (1943), p. 22.

<sup>3)</sup> p. III. – <sup>4)</sup> reprinted 1951 (cf. my review in Bibliotheca Orientalis).

## Authenticity.

Tradition attributes the authorship of the entire book to the prophet Jeremiah. We cannot understand that unless we assume the truth in the assertion to be that the prophet stands more or less indirectly behind most of the material. For *ch.* 36 relates that a great part of the words of Jeremiah have been written by his friend and disciple, the scribe *Baruch*, to whom the prophet has also directed the moving words of consolation in *ch.* 45, cf. also 32,12 and 43,3,6.

It is clear, as in the case of the other prophetic books, that all the material contained in the book cannot be derived from Jeremiah. That is manifest in the case of *ch.* 52, which cannot have been composed till after 561. And *chs.* 50-51, the speeches against Babylon, presuppose the same situation as *Is.* II. The same is true of others of the threatening verses against foreign nations (48,1-47, *Moab*; 49,7-22, *Edom*, which both stand in not quite clear relations to *Is.* 15-16 and *Ob.* 1-10, cf. also 49,18, cf. 50,50; 49,19-21, cf. 50,44-46; 49,22, cf. 48,40-41, all exhibiting the dependence of secondary material).<sup>1)</sup>

The prophecies against foreign nations have been definitely rejected as non-Jeremianic by *Volz*, who tried to prove that they form an originally separate book, introduced by 25,15-38. Against this theory, see *Eissfeldt*, pp. 408ff., cf. also *Pfeiffer*, p. 506, *Rudolph*, pp. 228ff. The latter tries to show that there is some genuine material in the section 46-51. He starts his argument from 25, 15ff. and assumes a Jeremianic nucleus in 48-49 and also in 46, while 47 is taken entirely as Jeremianic.

The *chs.* 50-51 are rejected entirely.

To my mind, *Pfeiffer's* arguments for the rejection of most of these oracles are convincing<sup>2)</sup>. Only 46,3-12 has - in v. 6 - an unmistakable reference to the battle of Carchemish in 605. 48-49 seem to be elaborations, parallel to *Is.* 15-16 and *Ob.*, of earlier poems; but it is not certain, that they are Jeremianic. In 46,13ff. there seems to be an allusion to *Ez.* 29,17-21 (from 571) as fulfilled by Nebuchadrezzar's victory over Amasis in 567. *Ch.* 47 *Pfeiffer* is inclined to combine with Alexander's conquest of Tyre or to regard it as an apocalyptic vision like 25,30-38; cf. also *Malamat*, in *Israel Exploration Journal* 1950-51.

In other sections of the book, too, everything cannot come from Jeremiah. This is certainly true of the *narratives*, which must have been told by another person, perhaps *Baruch*. But the question concerning original and not original words is much disputed, and all problems are made more difficult by the uncertainty which dominates in the field of the tradition of the text. *Duhm* laid down the principle that only the poetic sections are *verba ipsissima* of the prophet. But inside this material some parts reveal a background of later

<sup>1)</sup> cf. on *Obadiah*, p. 143 f.

<sup>2)</sup> pp. 506ff.



times and a markedly "Deutero-Isaianic" diction. To this material many reckon the famous chapters 30-31 with the important prophecies of the New Covenant.

### Composition.

The book exists in *two forms*, one in the Massoretic text, another in the so-called LXX. The latter does not bring the prophecies against foreign nations at the end of the book, but after 23, 13 (14 is not found in the LXX), and moreover not in the same order as the MT. Besides the LXX-form is much shorter, ca.  $\frac{1}{8}$  of the MT missing, mostly single verses or parts of verses, but also entire sections like 33,14-26; 39,4-13; 51,44b-49a; 52,27b-30. Textual criticism may explain some of these lacunae. 39,4-13 and 51,44b-49a have disappeared through homoioteleuton<sup>1)</sup>. In other places the translator has shortened a difficult text. But others have certainly not been present in his original, e.g. 33,14-26<sup>2)</sup>.

As mentioned above, *Bernhard Duhm* is also here the epoch-making commentator, who tried to define a criterion to separate the "genuine" from later material by pointing out that the book, besides the usual prophetic, rhythmic oracles, contains longer, sermon-like speeches, e.g. the Temple-speech, 7,1-8,3, the Sabbath-speech, 17,19-27, and the admonition to keep the law, ch. 11. *Duhm* further demonstrated the *deuteronomic* character of these speeches, but also the influence of Is. II and III, in other passages.

Against this *Eissfeldt*<sup>3)</sup> assumes a Jeremicanic nucleus in these sections, and *Pfeiffer*<sup>4)</sup> thinks that *Baruch* in preparing an edition of the book of Jeremiah, combining the prophet's book (cf. below) with his own, revised and rewrote entirely many of his master's speeches in his own deuteronomic style. This he could only have done after the death of Jeremiah, or at least without his knowledge. For the prophet could hardly have sanctioned such an extensive adulteration of his diction.<sup>5)</sup>

Undoubtedly this contains a great amount of truth. It does not seem probable, I think, that *Baruch* was the author of the deuteronomic sections.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. I, p. 99.

<sup>2)</sup> *Rudolph*, p. 184f., thinks that the Hebrew original of this section for a long time existed separately, as a sort of pamphlet, intended to fight the pessimism of the Jews who were waiting in vain for the fulfilment of the old promises. And as the author mainly took his material from Jer. it cannot surprise that the piece was later incorporated in the book, at the end of the section dealing with the promises of benediction for the whole nation. - Cf. also *Widengren*, *Literary and Psychol. Aspects*, p. 85.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 394f. <sup>4)</sup> p. 504f. <sup>5)</sup> but cf. *Widengren*, loc. cit.

But that Jeremiah has fallen into the hands of *deuteronomistic zealots*, who used him in their propaganda, seems evident.<sup>1)</sup> Like the churchmen of the Ancient Church, who successfully tried to make the often very critical founders of monastic life<sup>2)</sup> more ecclesiastical, the deuteronomists have tried to "deuteronomize" the prophet Jeremiah. But the radicalism both of the monastic reformers and of the prophet sometimes breaks through the orthodox varnish – e.g. in the case of Jeremiah in the temple-speech, ch. 7, where the violent polemic against the cultic forms as guarantees of the good-luck of the nation in spite of the deuteronomistic form cannot come from deuteronomists.<sup>3)</sup>

The views of *Duhm* and of *Eissfeldt* (cf. *Pfeiffer*) have been combined by *Birkeland*<sup>4)</sup>, who introduces the views of *Nyberg* in the criticism of the prophets and stresses the influence of *oral tradition*, even when a written tradition already has come into existence. The book of Jeremiah contains several complexes of traditions of the words of Jeremiah, some preserving the old poetical form, others cast in the style of deuteronomistic preaching. The poetical sections according to *Birkeland* have been fixed in writing earlier than the prose sermons.

In this connection the question of "*Baruch's roll*" comes in. According to ch. 36 Jeremiah, in the year 605, after the battle of Carchemish, had his earlier oracles written down by his friend *Baruch*, who as representative of the prophet read them to the people assembled in the temple area. This roll was read to and destroyed by king Jehoiakim; but Jeremiah had another scroll prepared, of which we are told that Baruch "wrote therein from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the book which Jehoiakim king of Judah had burned in the fire – and there were added besides unto them many like words". The last sentence must be understood to reveal that the verse had not been written by Baruch<sup>5)</sup>.

It has been the goal of scholars of many generations to separate the *scroll*

<sup>1)</sup> To the following cf. my *Die josianische Reform*, pp. 102ff.: *Studier over det zado-kidiske præsteskabs historie* (1931), p. 53f. *J. Ph. Hyatt*, *The Deuteronomic Edition of Jer.* (1951).

In my popular book, *Helgen eller Højforræder? Jeremias og hans folk*, (1943), p. 11, I have used the word "referater", "reports", of these sections, to make clear that they are not the *verba ipsissima* of the prophet, but editions of them, which nevertheless in some places reveal the original radicalism of the prophet. But cf. also *Widengren*, *Aspects*, pp. 48ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. the posthumous work of *W. Bousset*, *Apophthegmata* (1923).

<sup>3)</sup> cf. also the balanced treatment in *Rudolph's* commentary, p. XVf.

<sup>4)</sup> *Zum hebr. Traditionswesen*, p. 42.

<sup>5)</sup> *Birkeland*, *op. cit.* p. 43.

of *Baruch* from the rest of the book. It must be admitted<sup>1)</sup> that the roll probably cannot be found now. For presumably it has been handed down – as in the case of other prophetic books – in a circle of disciples, where it has been expanded both in oral tradition and later in written form.

Starting from the narrative *Jer.* 36 we may however say, that the primitive roll must have contained *words of doom*, at least mainly. The cause of the writing down after the battle of Carchemish must certainly have been that this event had made Jeremiah's threatening words of "the enemy from the North" actual. Therefore, being taken down in the middle of the life of the prophet, it must probably have contained the poetical, not prose texts; and being directed against Judah, it has presumably not had any prophecies against foreign nations. Finally, the oracles preserved in the roll must date from the time between 626 and 605. Accordingly it may with some certainty be assumed that it forms the base of chs. 1–25, the poetical parts of which mostly seem to come from this time. Perhaps 25,13 in its original form was the original subscription of this book.

This way of explaining the composite character of the book of Jeremiah is not irreconcilable with the older view, which worked with the theories of literary criticism and separated different "sources" in the book. There are a great many repetitions of the same texts inside the book, which cannot all be later additions of scribes (1,10, cf. 18,7,9; 2,25, cf. 18,11f., 7,1–15, cf. 26,1–6; 7,16, cf. 14,11ff. and 11,14; 7,17, cf. 44,15ff.; 7,21, cf. 6,20f.; 7,25, cf. 26,5; 7,26, cf. 16,12; 7,34, cf. 16,9 and 25,10; 21,9, cf. 38,2; 25,1–11a, cf. 36; 27 partly parallel to 28; 29,1–23, cf. 29,28; 34,1–7, cf. 38,14–23; 44,1–16, cf. 43,8–13,44,15–30<sup>2)</sup>).

These criteria were most brilliantly applied in *Mowinckel's* book of 1914, *Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia*; and the main lines of this view he upholds in his latest treatment of the book in the Norwegian translation from 1944, cf. also the brief review in the later book, *Prophecy and Tradition*, from 1946, pp. 61–65. The main elements are: A) The *primitive roll* from 605 with late additions, both of threatening and promising character. B) The *biography* of Jeremiah. C) The *deuteronomistic elements* with their many parallels to A and B. These elements have been combined, first A and B – *Mowinckel* now thinks, by Baruch who owned the roll and concluded it with the personal word from the prophet to himself in 45. Later C was incorporated, probably in the existing book of Baruch, and probably at a

<sup>1)</sup> *Birkeland*, p. 44.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Widengren*, *Aspects*, p. 85.



stage when both the book of Baruch and the deuteronomistic Jeremiah-tradition had been fixed in writing<sup>1</sup>).

From the assumed conclusion of Baruch's book in ch. 45 Mowinckel further infers that what follows, the "*Gentile oracles*" in 46-51, is an independent complex of tradition, perhaps containing some Jeremican elements (cf. Rudolph, whose commentary upon the whole follows Mowinckel's views), but which has only later been joined to 1-45.

A special problem concerns the so-called "*monologues*", the deeply personal poems alluded to above, 11,18-20,21-23; 12,1-6; 15,10-12; 15,15-21, 17,12-18; 18,18-23; 20,7-9; 20,10-13; 20,14-18. But also other passages may be added to the list, such as 4,19-21; 8,18-23; 10,19-22; 13,17; 14,17-18; 23,9, cf. 45,3. On account of the clearly visible *resemblance to the style of the Psalms* critics formerly regarded these passages as later additions. This has been completely altered by the views of the form-critical school<sup>2</sup>). The prophet has used the *style of the psalms of lamentation*, but not only to express his own grief. Also poems which do not contain a special word of God as answer to his prayer (e.g. 20,14-18), but only seem to be a violent expression of his sentiments, he has regarded as something, given him by God,<sup>3</sup>) which accordingly ought to be preserved. *Confessions* of this kind have hardly been publicly proclaimed, but have been preserved by disciples. Another explanation is sketched by Birkeland<sup>4</sup>): The monologues are a sort of *oracles of judgment*, for the sufferings of the prophet are blasphemy towards his God, involving punishment for those who bring the sufferings on the prophet.

*Commentaries: Giesebrecht* (1907, 2 ed.). *Duhm* (1901). *Volz* (1928, 2nd. ed.). *Rudolph* (1947).

For the understanding of chs. 4-6 the theory of *Duhm*, that the raids of the *Scythians*, related by *Herodotus* I, 103-106, between 630 and 625, have furnished the background of these chs., has played a great rôle. *Duhm* labelled these sections the "*Skythenlieder*". But

<sup>1</sup>) Mowinckel refers (p. 64) to the way in which both the speech and the Baruch text in ch. 3 have been subdivided and combined with each other as suggesting that they both existed in writing. The same he thinks suggested by the introductory dating notice in 32, 2-5, which hardly belongs to the speech, the usual heading of which we find in v. 1, and which also is erroneous with regard to the date (cf. 7ff.). But the note alludes to passages both from Baruch's narratives and from the deuteronomistic complex and so presupposes written texts.

<sup>2</sup>) For the earlier view, see *Stade*, ZATW 1886, and the works of *Schwally*, *Dillmann*, and *Hölscher* quoted by *Baumgartner* in his *Die Klagegedichte des Jeremia* (1917), the book which turned the tide in this question; cf. also Mowinckel, *Motiver og stilformer i profeten Jeremias diktning*, Edda, 1926, pp. 276-304.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Lindblom*, *Profetismen i Israel*, p. 326.

<sup>4</sup>) op. cit. p. 48.

there cannot be said anything for certain concerning this hypothesis, which also has been used to explain parts of the prophet *Zephaniah*. The foreign nation described in these chs. may just as well be the *Chaldeans*. Cf. the literature in *Robinson's* commentary on *Zeph.*, p. 184, and *F. W. König*, *Älteste Geschichte der Meder und Perser* (1934), pp. 35ff.; *A. Lauha*, *Zaphon* (1943), pp. 62ff., 72ff. *Rudolph*, pp. 41 ff. *Lauha* and *Rudolph* underline that the prophet did not think of an individual nation, but only expresses his conviction that a *foe from the North* would be the rod of punishment of Yahweh. But later he has seen a fulfilment of his visions in the attack of the Chaldeans under Nebuchadrezzar. Later these ideas became the basis of the idea of the "foe from the North" (Ez. 38-39) and "the Northern" (Joel. 2,20). But already at the time of Jeremiah the Jews have known old ideas of "the North" as implying elements of mystery (the mountain of the Gods etc.<sup>1</sup>) In my opinion we cannot argue for an "either-or" concerning the foe mentioned here. He is, in the prophet's mind, both a threatening political force from Mesopotamia, but also an "actualisation" of mysterious forces coming from the ends of the earth<sup>2</sup> or "the North". Lastly I suppose that the ideas of God's foes at the creation must be taken into account.<sup>3</sup> Cf. also *Baumgartner*, *Symbolae*... Hrozny ded. III, pp. 92ff. On *Jeremiah and the Deut. Reform*, see *Rowley*, in *Studies in OT Prophecy*, presented to T. H. Robinson (1950), pp. 157ff. *H. Cazelles*, in *Recherches de Science Rel.* 1951, pp. 5ff. — *Ed. Nielsen*, *Jeremia og Jojakim* (Dansk Teol. Tidsskr. 1950).

## THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL

### The Name of the Book and the Prophet.

The Hebrew form of the title of the book is *jēhezķē'l*, a name also borne by other persons in the OT<sup>3</sup>). LXX in Ez. transcribes it *'Iezekiēl*, but in 1 Chron. 24,16 we have *'Ezekēl*. Corresponding to this the *Vulgate* in Ez. writes *Ezechiel*, but 1 Chron. 24,16 *Hezechiel*. The form *Hesekiel* has been formed by *Luther*.

The prophet was *son of a priest* named *Buzi*, and consequently certainly was a priest himself (1,3). He was *married*, and his wife, "the desire of his eyes", died shortly before the fall of Jerusalem in 587 (24,15ff.). At that time the prophet according to 1,1; 3,15 lived in Babylonia at "the great canal", "the river of *Chebar*", in a place called *Tel-abib*, probably near the town of *Nippur*<sup>4</sup>), presumably some concentration-camp peopled with deported Jews used for

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Robinson's* commentary, and *Kapellrud*, *Joel-Studies* (1948), pp. 100ff.

<sup>2</sup>) The ideas in Jer. and elsewhere are then an expression of the "historicizing" tendency in the thought-world of Israel, cf. my book *Messias-Moses redivivus - Menschensohn* (1948), p. 7f. and elsewhere, and my paper in *Studia Theologica* I (1947), p. 186, cf. also the excellent remarks on Jeremiah 1,13ff. and chs. 4-6 in *Kapellrud's* op. cit., p. 104.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *lex.* and *Herrmann's* commentary, p. 12. <sup>4</sup>) cf. *Herrmann*, p. 11.

forced labour in the irrigation system of Babylonia<sup>1</sup>). He had been deported together with king Jehoiachin in 597. The latter date is supposed to be the starting-point of the datings of the book<sup>2</sup>). He had a house which he called his own (8,1). According to 1,2 he was called to be a prophet 5 years after his deportation.

The riddle of the date of 1,1 ("in the thirtieth year") is solved by some by assuming it to signify the age of the prophet at his vocation, while others (*Herrmann*) think that it is a date starting from the reform of Josiah. Of course the assumption of a scribal error has also been ventilated. At all events it does not conform to the other dates of the book, beginning with the year 597: *Bertholet* and others suppose an error for "13th" (385<sup>3</sup>).

The last dated prophecy of the book (29,17), "the twenty-seventh year", i.e. after the deportation of 597, accordingly must be 571. That would give the prophet a period of ca. 20 years for his work. Occasionally we hear that the leaders of the captives assemble in his house (8,1; 14,1; 20,1).

The book is more characterized by *visionary experiences* than the other prophetic books. From certain peculiarities in the behaviour of the prophet (dumbness, prolonged stay in the same bodily position, 3,24b-27; 4,4-8) some have assumed that he suffered from *cataleptic fits*<sup>4</sup>). "It would be completely wrong to oppose this assumption by saying that it degrades the prophet. From a religious point of view only one judgment can be passed on this. So, too, the disease must be considered a means ordained by God for the attainment of the goal of the prophetic preaching"<sup>5</sup>).

### Contents.

The plan of the book is apparently very clear. Its 48 chapters are divided into the following sections.

<sup>1</sup>) I think that the plight of the Jewish captives needs a fresh examination in the light of the material published by *E. F. Weidner* in *Mélanges Syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud* II (1939), pp. 923-927, cf. also *Albright* in *The Biblical Archaeologist*, V, 4 (Dec. 1942), pp. 49-55. We probably have to revise the idyllic picture generally given of the captivity, which is greatly at variance with the picture given by the captives themselves, esp. in *Is. II* and *Ps. 137*. - The quotations in this note are from *Finegan*, *Light from the Ancient Past* (1947), p. 188; cf. also *Galling*, *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels* (1950).

<sup>2</sup>) *Albright*, *JBL* (1932), pp. 77-106; *Finegan*, *The Chronology of Ezekiel* (*JBL* 1950, pp. 61ff.).

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Sellin*, *Gesch. des isr.-jüd. Volkes II* (1932), p. 39; *Torrey*, *JBL* 1934, pp. 306ff.

<sup>4</sup>) *Klostermann*, *ThStKr.* 1877, pp. 391-439. *Baentsch*, *ZWTh* 1907, pp. 52ff. *Erik Stave* in *Studier tilegnet Fr. Buhl* (1925), pp. 231ff. *Bertholet* (commentary 1936), pp. 16 and 18.

<sup>5</sup>) *Bertholet* (1936), referring to *v. Orelli*.



1-3: Inaugural vision; 4-24: Threats against Judah, both those deported and those remaining in Palestine after 597 (before 587); 25-32: Against foreign nations; 33: The prophet gets the tidings of the fall of Jerusalem. 34-48: Messianic promises. The latter section may be divided into three subdivisions, Ezekiel – or the editor of the book – believing in three periods in the time of restoration. 1) 34-37, on the Messiah (34), the destruction of Edom (35), and the resurrection of the people (37); 2) The last distress after the return (Gog, 38-39); 3) the final deliverance, the new temple and the laws for the new congregation (40-48).

### Authenticity.

The tradition of *Baba bathra* says that Ez. was written by the “Great Synagogue”<sup>1)</sup>. A statement by *Josephus* (Ant. X, 79), that Ezekiel wrote *two* books, has caused much dispute among scholars. The book belongs to the writings the use of which some rabbis tried to limit on account of its deviations from the laws of Moses<sup>2)</sup>. Shabbath 13 b, cf. Hagiga 13 a, Menahoth 45 a, however tell us that the difficulty was solved. *Rabbi Hananiah ben Hezekiah* went to his upper chamber, and they brought him 300 jars of oil (for his lamp), and he explained the deviations so that the book was rehabilitated. Hagiga 13 a also mentions the other cause of the attacks on the book: Some mystic teachings, connected with the “vision of the chariot”, i.e. the inaugural vision, ch. 1, led to the death of a young man who discovered the meaning of the word *hašmal* (1,4)<sup>2a)</sup>. But also this difficulty was removed through the industry of *rabbi Hananiah*.

Generally modern research has defended the authenticity of the book.<sup>3)</sup> But in recent years the views applied to the other prophetic books have also been brought to bear on the case of the book of Ez., namely that it has not got its shape from the prophet's own hand, but as a work of later traditionists, recording oral traditions from the disciples of the prophet.<sup>4)</sup>

*Literary criticism* generally accepted the book as it stands. Before *Hölscher* mainly *Smend* (commentary, 2nd ed. 1880) considered its prophecies to be *vaticinia ex eventu* and the dates to be fictions. *Bertholet* in his first commentary (1897) stressed the extremely bad state of the text and maintained that many sections are not in their proper places. The *documentary hypotheses* were tried especially by *Kraetzschmar* (commentary 1901), who started from some *doublets* (1,1-3,13-14; 3,4-9; 4,9-17; 7,1-9 etc.) and attempted a separation of *two parallel recensions*, one using the first person, another the third person,

<sup>1)</sup> cf. I, p. 26f.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. I, p. 29. <sup>2a)</sup> On this word, see *G. R. Driver*, in *Vetus Testamentum* (1951), pp. 60ff. and *Irwin*, *ibid.* 1952, pp. 169f.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 525.

<sup>4)</sup> For a survey of the history of research in this field, see *Pfeiffer*, pp. 525ff. Here the ideas of *Birkeland*, in the book mentioned on p. 114, have not been considered.

joined together by a redactor. *Budde*<sup>1)</sup> thinks of different, later combined *editions* of the book. The commentary of *Herrmann* (1924) assumes a series of separate collections, combined by the prophet throughout his long life, but not according to a definite plan, and even exhibiting traces of old age infirmity (p. XIX); secondary additions and redactional supplements are also assumed (p. XXXIV). The theory of *parallel recensions* is developed in a new manner by *Bertholet* in his second commentary (1936), combined with the idea, also launched by others, that part of the material originated in a Jerusalemite period of the prophet<sup>2)</sup>. – In all this the obscure tradition of *Josephus* of the *two* books of Ezekiel plays a great part.

During the 19th century a couple of scholars, *Zunz*<sup>3)</sup> and *Seinecke*<sup>4)</sup>, rejected the authenticity, dating it to the second half of the 5th century or even to the time of the Maccabees, making it a sort of pseudopigraph. In our times this opinion is represented by the famous orientalist *C. C. Torrey*<sup>5)</sup>, who dates the book to ca. 230 B. C. A similar position is taken up by *Messel* in his *Ezechielfragen* from 1945 and in his commentary.<sup>6)</sup>

Most influential the book of *Hölscher*<sup>7)</sup> has been. He applies the method known from the Jeremiah-commentary of *Duhm*. The title of Hölscher's book is its programme. The comparatively few rhythmical sections, plus part of the visions in 1 and 8–9 and 11,24–25, and part of the narratives in 4–6 come from the prophet Ezekiel. The rest, the prosaic parts, is the work of the real authors of the book, living in the 5th century.

*Hölscher's* ideas have, with a slight modification concerning the date, been accepted by *v. Gall*, *Basileia tou Theou* (1926), pp. 175 and 200. Concerning further literature I refer to my *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie* (1931), pp. 101ff., and to the penetrating criticism in *Hertrich's* book, pp. 12–30, where the theses of Hölscher are essentially rejected; but nevertheless *Hertrich* gives Hölscher the honour of having seen the problem of the book. In reality most of Hölscher's critics in principle accept his point of view. The book as it stands now is no authentic work of the prophet Ezekiel. Already *Mowinkel* has seen the solution given by Hölscher, in his book on the composition of Jeremiah from 1914 and in *Ezra den Skriftlærde* (1916), pp. 125ff. – On the lines of Hölscher we also find *Irwin*, *The Problem of Ezekiel* (1943).

See *Eissfeldt* (cf. below, p. 129).

### The Composition of the Book.

We have, accordingly, come to a point in the history of research which has been reached in most of the other OT books. Its authenticity has been given up. Further it has been established that there are remarkable parallels

<sup>1)</sup> *Gesch. d. althebr. Lit.* pp. 154ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. also *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 1936, pp. 4ff.; *Hertrich*, *Ezechielp Probleme* (1932); *J. Smith*, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (1931).

<sup>3)</sup> *Bibelkritisches II*, Ezekiel, ZDMG 1873, pp. 676–89; *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, 2nd ed. p. 167.,

<sup>4)</sup> *Geschichte des Volkes Israel II* (1884), pp. 1–20.

<sup>5)</sup> *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the original prophecy* (1930), cf. the criticism in *Rev. Bibl.* 1931, pp. 313ff.; *Harvard Theol. Rev.* 1931, pp. 245ff., and *Hertrich*, op. cit. pp. 48ff.

<sup>6)</sup> in the Norwegian translation of the Old Testament by *Michelet*, *Mowinkel*, and *Messel*, vol. III (1944). – Against *Messel*, cf. *Kapelrud*, *Svensk Exeg.* Årsbok 1948, pp. 88ff.,

<sup>7)</sup> *Hesekiel, der Dichter und das Buch* (Beih. ZATW 1924).

in the book. It has been demonstrated ad oculos e.g. in the commentary of Bertholet from 1936, where the parallels are given in synoptic tables. It is obvious, too, that 3,22-24 + 4,4-5 + 3,26 + 24,26-27 + 33,21-22 belong together. This proves that there are queer interruptions in the "story" of the book<sup>1)</sup>. The dates – although mainly given in chronological order – are in disorder in the group 26-33,21<sup>2)</sup>.

Of importance is the parallel to the Book of Jeremiah, *the mixture of poetical, rhythmical sections and longwinded sermons*, in this book not of deuteronomistic, but "priestly" ("Aaronitic") tinge. The similarity of diction between Ez. and the Code of Holiness has often been underlined.

This seems to indicate that *the solution of the problems is to be sought along the same lines as in the case of Jer.* We have a complex of poetical words by the prophet-master Ezekiel, transmitted orally and at length fixed in writing. But alongside with this we have – parallel to the deuteronomistic parts of Jer. – complexes of prose sermons, probably also based on words of the prophet, but transformed under the influence of disciples, and perhaps already in oral, but perhaps also in written form, joined to the collection of poems. In this way the composition of the book was understood by Hempel<sup>3)</sup> and Birkeland<sup>4)</sup>. – All this then at length became the Book of Ezekiel, edited some time before 516, according to the probable date given by v. Gall, Hempel, and others. For the book cannot presuppose the completion of the second temple, which does not agree with the temple-plan of the book in chs. 40ff.<sup>5)</sup> In this way the "two faces" of the book can be understood. But just as the deuteronomistic sections of Jer. are a tradition of a Jeremianic nucleus, so also are the "Aaronitic" words of Ez. a tradition ultimately coming from the prophet Ezekiel, handed down in a circle of disciples who developed the preaching of the prophet in this manner. This circle consisted of members of the family of Ezekiel, the Zadokite clan in Jerusalem, who made the prophet their authority in matters concerning the restoration of the cult at the Jerusalemite temple<sup>6)</sup>. From the final redaction then comes the developed scheme in the present book: first the threatening speeches against the countrymen of the prophet, then against foreign nations, and finally oracles of salvation with a plan for the new congregation. At the fixing in writing the redactor(s) were of course

<sup>1)</sup> Eissfeldt, p. 419.

<sup>2)</sup> Birkeland, *Zum hebr. Traditionswesen*, p. 54f.; cf. Widengren, *Aspects*, p. 76.

<sup>3)</sup> *Die althebr. Lit.*, p. 170. <sup>4)</sup> *op. cit.*

<sup>5)</sup> *op. cit.*

<sup>6)</sup> cf. *Det zadokidske præsteskabshistorie*, p. 45 and the references in the notes.

<sup>7)</sup> cf. *Det zadokidske præsteskabshistorie*, pp. 49ff.



bound to the finished complexes, which had developed in the tradition of the different circles. This explains e.g. the disorder of the dates and the parallels, especially in chs. 29 ff.<sup>1)</sup>

### Did Ezekiel prophesy in Judæa?

Of late the idea has been variously defended that part of Ezekiel's prophetic work was done in Jerusalem. The traditional view, according to the representation given in the book, is that the prophet uttered his oracles against Jerusalem and Judah in Babylon, often in the presence of the deported captives.<sup>2)</sup> Against this Pfeiffer<sup>3)</sup> argues that this "turns Ezekiel into a Jonah who failed to obey the divine command, "Go, get thee unto the house of Israel" "(cf. 3,4). In adhesion to Hertrich, Pfeiffer maintains that other items of the book prove that Ezekiel worked in the Judæan capital. Unless Ezekiel was physically in Jerusalem, some categorical statements in the book must be classed as fiction pure and simple (so G. Hölscher, Hesekiel) or be explained through "para-psychic phenomena". E.g. the simplest explanation of 11,13 must be that the prophet was in Jerusalem. "Ezekiel could have seen Pelatiah die, through second sight, but how could Pelatiah have died as a result of the denunciations of Ezekiel unless the prophet was present?"<sup>4)</sup> In the same way are explained the passages 24,1f.; 12,2, cf. 12,1-7; 5,2; 20,31: All these verses presuppose that the prophet was actually in Jerusalem during the years immediately before 587. Pfeiffer explains 8,1-4 - against one of the contradictions in this text - not as a vision, but in the light of 1 Kings 18,12; 2 Kings 2,16; Mt. 4,1; Lk. 4,1 as a "transportation or leading through the spirit of God" as implying "a motion of the body, not a flight of the spirit in a trance", cf. 3,12-15, and presumably 11,1. The words pointing to the latter understanding ("in divine visions") are assumed to be a gloss, taken from 40, 2, where, as in 37,1; 43,5, the prophet does not witness actual occurrences but only sees hallucinatory apparitions. - An expression like *bētok hā'ir* (5,2) is also most naturally taken as alluding to Jerusalem.

This would mean that Ezekiel immediately after his vocation in 593 went to Jerusalem and there worked on the same lines as Jeremiah, apparently without meeting the same fate as his older fellow-prophet. The death of his wife is thought to have occurred during the siege of Jerusalem. It is difficult

<sup>1)</sup> Birkeland, p. 58. But cf. now the article of Finegan (above, p. 123, n. 2); M. A. Schmidt, Zur Komposition des Buches Hesekiel (Theol. Zeitschr. Basel 1950, pp. 81 ff.).

<sup>2)</sup> This conception is still defended by Cooke, 1936, pp. XXIII ff. <sup>3)</sup> p. 536.

<sup>4)</sup> Pfeiffer, p. 537, here refers to C. C. Torrey, Pseudo-Ezekiel, p. 40; cf. also Bertholet. Widengren, Aspects, pp. 102 ff., assumes para-psychic phenomena.

to determine when he left the besieged city<sup>1</sup>). At least he was not in the town when it was taken by the Chaldeans, for we are told that he got the news of the fall of the city through a messenger (33,21).

It is not easy to determine what is the truth in this matter. As the text stands it is most probable that the prophet worked in a trance against the city, from which he had been deported. But there is no improbability in the arguments against this. And it cannot be called impossible that the Babylonians have allowed him to go back to the city – on the contrary, they may have used him and his preaching for their own purpose, as clever propagandists of to day – by omissions and isolated quotations – often do. The most weighty argument would be the argumentum e silentio, that we hear nothing of his having been accused by the Jews, like Jeremiah, of high treason. Being however of the privileged priesthood of the town, he may more easily have evaded the fate of his brother prophet, who was only “of the priests of Anathoth”, the country priests living at Jerusalem by the “grace” of their Zadokite “brethren” (2 Kings. 23,9).

The obscurity concerning the place of living of Ezekiel cannot be dissolved completely. To a great extent the question is one of right or wrong interpretation of certain passages. The possibility of a Palestinian period in the ministry of the prophet cannot be dismissed *a limine*; but *proof* has not been given against the traditional view.<sup>2</sup>).

The influence of the book in the Jewish congregation is immense. The teaching of individual retribution (chs. 14 and 18), the nomistic-ritualistic element in its view of life, the stressing of the distinction between “clean and unclean”, the theocratic constitution, the “divided hope for the future” (the idea of a “millenium” between the beginnings and the fulfilment of salvation) have been of great importance for later times. But concerning these matters we must refer readers to the history of Israel’s religion.

The most influential commentaries have been mentioned above. Of most recent works that of I. G. Matthews (1939) gives a very sober treatment of the problems, dating the prophet between 593 and 570 B. C. and the Babylonian editor between 520 and 500 B.C. The chs. 1–24 he thinks to a great extent “delivered in person to the citizens of Jerusalem and Judah, in a time of siege, threatened and actual, for which the most likely dates are 590–586 (cf. 17,1–21; 19,1–14; 24,2–24; 4,1–3 *et al.*)”. Chs. 40–48 he refers to the years between 540 and 500 as “a reaction of the Zerubbabel catastrophe of 516”. This catastrophe being a most uncertain hypothesis (cf. my paper quoted below, p. 156) I must express my doubts concerning this point. But also this dating is generally sound. For the question of

<sup>1</sup>) See the different opinions of Bertholet (1936), p. XVI, and O. R. Fischer in an unpublished dissertation quoted by Pfeiffer, p. 539. <sup>2</sup>) The actual death of Pelatiah may be due to influence of legend (11,13).

the Judaeen ministry of the prophet, see also *P. Auvray*, *Ézéchiél* (1947), and *van den Born*, *De historische situatie van Ezechiëls prophetie* (1947). *Wheeler Robinson*, *Two Hebrew Prophets* (1948). *Eissfeldt*, in *The OT and Modern Study*, ed. *Rowley*, pp. 155ff.

Concerning the relations of the book to later *Apocalyptic*, see *L. Dürr*, *Die Stellung des Propheten Ezechiel in der israelitisch-jüdischen Apokalyptik* (1923); *W. Grankowski*, *Le Messianisme d'Ézéchiél* (1930). – *G. Gerleman*, *Hesekielbokens Gog*, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1947, pp. 148 ff. gives an important contribution to the origin of the Gog-chapters, the name probably coming from the Balaam-prophecies in Num., but in a text which in Num. 24,4 read Gog for Agag. – *Howie*, *The Date and Composition of Ezekiel* (1950) I have not seen – cf. *Rowley*, *The OT and Modern Study*, p. 150, n. 1.

### THE DODECAPROPHETON

The last book of the Canon of Prophets in Jewish tradition is called *šēnēm 'āsār* (Hebr.) or *tēre 'asar*, contracted *tērēsār* (Aram.), a title known also to *Jerome* in his *Prologus Galeatus*. *Ecclus.* 49, 10 speaks of the collection as a whole, corresponding to the Hebrew and Aramaic name. On Greek soil we find the word used as superscription of the present paragraph<sup>1</sup>). The Masoretic notes concerning the number of verses are generally found at the end of Mal.<sup>2</sup>) But the manuscript L of the *Biblia Hebraica*, 3rd ed., has them after each of the books.<sup>3</sup>)

The arrangement of the books of the Dodecapropheton is different in MT and the LXX (cf. *Jerome*, *Praefatio in XII Prophetas*). The LXX generally gives the order Hosca, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah. What the cause of this may be is uncertain. It has been assumed that MT aims at a chronological arrangement, while the LXX places the books according to their size. In the LXX the Book of the Twelve stands before Isaiah.<sup>4</sup>) *Jerome* placed it as the last book in the Canon. – That the Jewish arrangement aims at a chronological order follows from the discussion in *Baba bathra* 14b.<sup>5</sup>)

The usual name, *The Minor Prophets*, does not imply that these books are of minor value, but only applies to the size of the books. The distinction between Major and Minor Prophets first appears in the Latin Churches. *Augustine* has the explanation that it signifies a difference in size, not in value<sup>6</sup>).

There are several recent editions of the *Ethiopic text* of the Minor Prophets, not accessible to me, viz. *Amos* (Pereira), *Jonah*, *Nahum*, *Habakkuk*, *Zephaniah*, *Zechariah*, *Malachi* (Lofgren), *Obadiah*, *Malachi* (Bachmann).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Josephus*, *Contra Apionem* I, 40 and *Melito of Sardis* (cf. *Kuenen*, *Einkl.* II, p. 309).

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Kuenen* p. 308.

<sup>3</sup>) On *Ecclus.* 49, 10 see *Nöldeke*, *ZATW* 1888, p. 156, against *Böhme*, *ibid.* 1887, p. 280.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 36. <sup>5</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 32.

<sup>6</sup>) *De civ. Dei*, 18, 29 (quoted by *Marti*, *Das Dodekapropheton*, p. XIV).



## HOSEA

*The Prophet.*

The book comes from the circle of disciples belonging to a certain *Hosea*, Hebr. *hōšēa'*, LXX *Ōsēē*. The name is once used of Joshua (Num. 13,14, LXX *Ausē*), and it was the name of the last king of the Northern kingdom (2 Ki. 15,30). The prophet is called son of *Beerī*. He lived in the *Northern kingdom* ("our king", 7,5). The passages mentioning *Judah* do not contradict this even if they are considered "genuine"<sup>1</sup>). *Duhm* concluded from his knowledge of the intrigues of the mighty men that he belonged to the upper classes, perhaps the circles of the priests<sup>2</sup>). If chs. 1-3 are not to be understood as allegory<sup>3</sup>), but as describing real events, we are very well informed concerning some crucial incidents in his life, his love for his wife being of decisive importance for his preaching. His passionate, lyrical, loving personality expresses itself most vividly in his poems.

According to the superscription 1,1 his life-work belongs to the last days of the Northern kingdom. His activity is said to have begun in the prosperous days of *Jeroboam II* (788-47). From 11,11 we may conclude that he still lived after the fall of Samaria in 721 and predicted the return from captivity<sup>4</sup>). Accordingly he is a contemporary of Amos and Isaiah. The main part of his words most probably do not belong to the happy era of Jeroboam II, but to the perplexed days after the fall of the dynasty of Jehu ca. 745. According to *Baba bathra* 14b the place of the book was determined on the ground of the words in 1,2.

*Contents.*

The book has 14 chapters.

1-3 describes incidents concerning the marriage of the prophet, with a speech of Yahweh in ch. 2. - 4-14 is a loosely composed collection of oracles, mostly, but not exclusively, of threatening character, and mostly, but not exclusively, directed against Northern Israel. A tone of its own characterizes 9,10-14,10, varying the theme "Oh, how different...!" (e.g. 11,1ff.): In the desert days Israel and Yahweh were on right terms, but the entry into Canaan spoiled the relations. The theme reminds of the style of funeral dirges.

<sup>1</sup>) *Duhm*, *Theologie der Propheten* (1875), p. 130.

<sup>2</sup>) *Engnell*, *Svenskt Bibliotek Uppslagsverk*, art. Hosea, pleads for his Judahite extractions or of least for his Judaic sympathies, but. cf. 7,5.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. below.

<sup>4</sup>) *Robinson*. 13,12-14b, also quoted by *Robinson* in this connection, cannot with certainty be understood as a prophecy of weal.

*Authenticity and Integrity: The marriage of the prophet.*

The understanding of the oracles is often made difficult on account of the corrupt state of the text. Of course this warns us to be extremely cautious in the questions of primary and secondary elements. The often quoted, important book of H. S. Nyberg, *Studien zum Hoseabuche* (1935), represents a sound reaction against the unprincipled use of conjecture, e.g. in the commentary of Sellin<sup>1</sup>). The textually best transmitted passages are the chs. 1-3. We have here three ingredients<sup>2</sup>), viz. two narratives of Hosea (1 and 3), one (1) given in the third pers., the other (3) in the first. pers., and a speech of Yahweh on his relations with Israel (ch. 2). These chs. being of decisive importance for the question of the "genuineness" of the oracles of promise we must necessarily examine the question of the marriage of the prophet.

It is quite impossible to register all the hypotheses which have been advanced concerning this matter. Only some broad lines may be given.

Some have understood the whole as an *allegory*, not as real incidents in the life of the prophet.<sup>3</sup>) But against the allegorical interpretation speak the features of the narrative not capable of being allegorized, e.g. the name of the wife, *Gomer*, the daughter of Diblaim. The same is the case with the ransom mentioned in 3. Against the literal understanding it cannot be said that this is obscene, for if there is anything obscene in the story, then it does not disappear through allegorization.

It has also been assumed that the whole story is a *visionary experience* of the prophet<sup>4</sup>). But this is nowhere to be seen in the text.

According to some scholars, e. g. Wellhausen<sup>5</sup>), the prophet did not realize the unfaithfulness of his wife till after the birth of the children: The whole story is the *later interpretation* of his marriage story. This might be illustrated by parallels like Jer. 32,8 and Zech. 6,11 (cf. Jer. 18 and 35). But it is contradicted by 1,2, where the whole story develops as consequence of the command of Yahweh.

Nowadays it is widely assumed that Hosea *really married* a prostitute. Such marriages are known from Babylonia<sup>6</sup>), and Lev. 21,7 prohibits the priests to enter into such relations, presupposing that such marriages were relatively common among ordinary people. This does not prevent that Hosea may have loved this woman. Without this the symbolic act of the prophet is quite impossible<sup>7</sup>).

But recently another understanding of the marriage, not without precedents in the history of interpretation, has been advocated in different ways by H. S. Nyberg and

<sup>1</sup>) Cf. vol. I, pp. 95f. and 195, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. Eissfeldt, pp. 431ff.

<sup>3</sup>) Reuss, *Das AT*, II, s. 88. Gressmann, *SAT* II, I (1921).

<sup>4</sup>) Gressmann, op. cit., cf. Johs. Pedersen, *Israel III-IV*, p. 537.

<sup>5</sup>) Kl. Proph., pp. 105ff.

<sup>6</sup>) Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien* I, p. 400, II, p. 436, cf. Engnell, loc. cit.

<sup>7</sup>) cf. Meissner, op. cit. I, p. 400.

R. H. Pfeiffer.<sup>1)</sup> According to the former Gomer was no prostitute, but a foreign woman, "from Diblataim" in Moab. The woman in ch. 3 is a second wife, who is a real prostitute. The first marriage is to illustrate the breach with the national God El eljon in Jerusalem, the other that with the tribal God Yahweh. Pfeiffer similarly assumes that the two chs. speak of different women, and also assumes the second to be a "common streetwalker", purchased by the prophet for the price of an ordinary slave and kept in seclusion for a long time as a symbol of Israel's impending loss of king, prince, and cultic implements. Pfeiffer maintains that 1,2 does not mean that Gomer was a prostitute, the word "whoredoms" meaning religious apostasy as in 12,4 and 6, cf. 4,12b and 5,4b. The last clause of 1,2 according to Pfeiffer explains that the wife and children must inevitably be in a state of (religious) fornication because the whole land is in such a state. Nyberg illuminates this assumption by a thoroughgoing analysis of the religious meaning of the words. — In 3,1 Pfeiffer combines the 'od of v. 1 with the preceding clause, meaning that God addressed Hosea "a second time".

Many scholars however think that ch. 3 is a parallel to ch. 1, the 'od being a gloss. This was assumed in the Danish edition of the present book. But the arguments of Nyberg and Pfeiffer have very much convincing power, although I cannot suppress a feeling of the hypothetical nature of all the theories advanced.

So much can be said, that the stories (ch. 3) seem to indicate that Hosea assumes a possibility of conversion and return to the national God. According to Pfeiffer ch. 1 as its point has "not a domestic tragedy of Hosea but the moral and religious defection of Israel, indicated allegorically in the significant names of Hosea's children and denounced at length in ch. 2. The point of ch. 3 brought out by a symbolical action that has nothing to do with Hosea's family life, is that Jehovah still loves his adulterous nation and will take measures to bring it to its senses (cf. 2,16)". This may perhaps be combined with Nyberg's hypothesis of Gomer as being a "foreign woman", symbolical of the grace of Yahweh, spending itself on a people to which he had originally no obligations at all.

Accordingly, *promises are possible in the preaching of the prophet*, and it will be unmethodical to excise all prophecies of weal from the book, as is done e.g. by Marti and Volz<sup>2)</sup>. The strong preaching of Yahweh's unhappy love for Israel, which can express itself in words like 11,8–9, that his holiness prevents him from destroying Israel, must also imply that the prophet has hoped for the salvation of the people. But that does not mean that all prophecies of weal are genuine, and not all of the passages understood as promises are capable of this interpretation, instar omnium 13,14 (cf. 1 Cor. 15,55), where

<sup>1)</sup> Nyberg, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1941, vol. 7, fasc. 12; cf. Engnell, loc. cit. Pfeiffer, in his Introduction.

<sup>2)</sup> Volz, Die vorexilische Jahweprophete und der Messias (1897), pp. 24–40; cf. the cautious words by Wheeler Robinson, Two Hebrew Prophets, p. 17.



the context decisively speaks in favour of an interpretation as two threatening questions. Yahweh conjures up the forces of the underworld to destroy the unfaithful people. In the concluding prophecy of promise (14,2ff.) there is nothing indicating post-exilic origin.

As with the element of promise in the book, so with the passages dealing with *Judah*. These pieces were excised by the criticism of the late 19th century. But a passage like 5,8-6,6<sup>1)</sup> proves that the prophet must have spoken of Judah, the passage being devoid of meaning, if we were to delete Judah here<sup>2)</sup>. The question "genuine or not genuine" must be raised in each individual case. 1,7 e.g. hardly came from the mouth of Hosea, because it has nothing in common with the meaning of the figure and has nothing corresponding to it in the cases of the other children.

*Literature.* Commentaries in the common series. *Wellhausen* (3rd. ed. 1892). *Lindblom*, Hosea literarisch untersucht (1927). *Th. C. Vriezen*, Hosea: Profeet en Cultuur (1941). *Allwöhn*, Die Ehe des Propheten Hosea in psychoanalytischer Beleuchtung (1926). Some articles on Hosea and the fertility cult are quoted by *Pfeiffer*, p. 569, n. 8, with criticism in n. 9. — *Wheeler Robinson*, Two Hebrew Prophets (1948).

## JOEL

### *Name and Contents.*

As author is given *Joel, son of Pethuel*. The name, also used of other persons in the OT, has the same meaning as *Elijah*, and it has sometimes been suggested that it should give a hint, that the author of the book was the "messenger" predicted by *Malachi* (*Mal.* 3,1,23<sup>3)</sup>). We have no more information concerning the person of the prophet. The book is localized in Jerusalem (2,1,5,23; 3,5; 4,1,6,8,16,17,18,20,21).

In the *Hebrew text* the book is divided into 4 chapters, while the LXX, the Vulgate, Luther and the Versions after the Reformation have only 3 chapters. The division here is however different. LXX and Vulg. and the English version combine the chs. 2 and 3 of Hebr. while Luther and some of his followers, e.g. the Danish version, join chs. 3 and 4 of the Hebrew to one another. We give our quotations according to the Hebrew arrangement.

1,2-2,17 describes a terrible visitation of *locusts* (1,2-4). This the author takes as starting point for an admonition to the people and especially the *priests* to mourn penitently. He sings a song of lamentation on the distress (vv. 15-20). In ch. 2,1-11 the prophet

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Alt*, in *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.* 1919, pp. 537ff.; *Hans Schmidt*, *Sellin-Festschrift* 1927, pp. 11 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 431.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Marti*, p. 109.

sounds the alarm for Zion, because the enemy enters the city – the locusts being now described as a military host. To this he adds a call to conversion (vv. 12–14) and a fresh admonition to arrange a day of penitence. Here (v. 17), as in 1,15–20, he sings the song of lamentation appropriate for such a day. – From 2,18 it appears that this admonition has been followed. For the verse, which has the form of *narrative*, tells us that Yahweh intervened and saved the land. Now Yahweh promises new fertility (2,19–27), the outpouring of the Spirit over everybody in his people (3,1–5, cf. Act. 2,16 ff.), and a terrible *dies irae* against the enemies of the people, the Philistines, Phoenicians, Egyptians, and Edom (ch. 4). In 4,6 we are told that the people has been sold to the Jonians, *Jawan*.

### *The Problem of the Book.*

The main difficulty of interpretation lies in 1,2–2,17. Some, e.g. *Merx*<sup>1)</sup>, consider this section a *prediction*, like 3–4. But most commentators now understand the first section as a description of present events. What makes this interpretation difficult is that this part of the book in several places mentions the “Day of Yahweh” (1,15; 2,1,2,10,11). Accordingly the grasshoppers should not be “real locusts”, but *symbols* as in Apoc. Joh. 9, 1–12, giving the entire book, not only its second part, an apocalyptic character. This does however not agree with the description of the locusts in the beginning of the book. The visitation seems to be a *real invasion of swarms of locusts*, in 2,1 ff. compared with an enemy army devastating the country. The last part of the book (3–4) being evidently *eschatological*, *Duhm*<sup>2)</sup> assumed that these chapters were added to the description of the plague of locusts in 1–2, this addition having caused an eschatological reinterpretation of 1–2 by insertion of the verses mentioning “the Day of Yahweh”<sup>3)</sup>. The locusts have been understood as apocalyptic symbols, the comparison, in 2,2–9 having led to identification. This is thought to be affirmed by 2,20 which seems to use the expression “*The Northern*” known from other literature (Jer. 1,14; 4,6; 6,1— cf. Ez. 38,6,15; 39,2; Is. 14,13; Ps. 48,3) in a formalistic manner as designation of the locusts<sup>4)</sup>. But this theory of interpolation and addition of chs. 3–4 is unnecessary<sup>5)</sup>. The prophet has considered the plague of locusts,

1) Die Prophetie des Joel und ihre Ausleger (1879).

2) ZATW 1911.

3) cf. *Eissfeldt*, pp. 436 ff.

4) Concerning “the Northern” cf. further *Gunkel*, Schöpfung und Chaos (1895), p. 217 f; *Stocks*, Neue kirchl. Zeitschr. 1908, pp. 225 ff; *Gressmann*, Der Messias (1929), pp. 134 ff.; *Eissfeldt*, Baal Zaphon (1932), pp. 18 ff.; *Aarre Lauha*, Zaphon, der Norden und die Nordvölker im Alten Testament (1943), pp. 74 ff.; *Kapelrud*, Joel Studies (1948), pp. 93 ff.

5) This is particularly stressed by *Kapelrud*, who, however, seems to be ignorant of the fact that *Gray*, *Driver-Lanchester*, *Wade*, *van Hoonacker* and *Gautier* all hold this view (cf. *Rowley*, Expos. Times). My own opinion, as expressed above, was the same in the Danish edition of this book (1941).

according to 1,19-20 coinciding with a period of drought, as the beginning of the Day of Judgement. And consequently he has regarded the deliverance (2,18ff.) as the inauguration of the Messianic Golden Age<sup>1</sup>).

### *Authenticity and Integrity.*

This has led us to the problem of the *unity of the book*. There is nothing which indicates that 1-2 are not a unity. Even the passages dealing with the Day of Yahweh may be retained as original (cf. above). The different literary types of the sections (the "liturgies"<sup>2</sup>) in 1,19-20; 2,12-14; 2,19-20) may very well come from the same poet, especially because the liturgical piece in 2,17f. evidently is organically connected with 2,15-18<sup>3</sup>). 3-4, on the other hand, are often regarded as a collection of heterogeneous elements. The arguments are however not very strong. It is argued that some sections (4,9-14) are fine poetry, while others (e.g. 4,1-3) do not deserve that praise or are composed as a mosaic of older phrases (4,15-17). But Pfeiffer<sup>4</sup>) rightly asserts that there is no compelling reason for attributing the two parts of the book to different authors. He underlines that the parts seem to have been spoken at about the same time. The distress described in 1-2 and the deliverance may well have given the prophet occasion to attempt a description of coming bliss. In this attempt he used old material to show that now the earlier prophecies were to be fulfilled. As maintained in the Danish edition of this book this may explain the impression of disparateness given by the later chapters.<sup>5</sup>)

### *The Date of the Book.*

If we are right in assuming that the order of the Minor Prophets in the MT aims at being chronological Jewish tradition should have considered Joel one of the earliest prophets. But this is not clear in *Baba bathra 14b*, cf. LXX, which places Joel after Micah. This tradition was maintained in later Christian theology, e.g. by Hengstenberg<sup>6</sup>), against Credner who attempted to prove

<sup>1</sup>) cf. Pfeiffer, p. 575, and of course Kapelrud.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 161 f.

<sup>3</sup>) Robinson, in his commentary in Eissfeldt's Handbuch, p. 56.

<sup>4</sup>) loc. cit., cf. Kapelrud, pp. 51 ff.

<sup>5</sup>) Pfeiffer, loc. cit., points out that similar observations are to be made in Ezekiel, Daniel, Apoc. Joh., cf. Haggai and Zechariah, and especially Is. 13,17-22, where the overthrow of Babylon by the Medes becomes a symbol for the Day of Judgment (I suppose a misprint in Pfeiffer's text: Read Is. 13,7-22); cf. Rowley, Expos. Times (above, p. 134).

<sup>6</sup>) Christologie des AT III (1835), p. 139; I, (1854) pp. 333 ff.



that Joel was older, dating from the 9th century<sup>1</sup>). In this way he accounted for the fact that the king is not mentioned in the book, the prophet belonging to the years when Jehoash (837–798) was a minor, while the priest Jehoiada ruled for him. A comparatively early date is still maintained e.g. by *Eduard König* in his Introduction from 1893. He prefers a date shortly after the death of *Josiah* (609). A date of the prophet's activity ca. 600 is advocated by *Kapelrud* (1948), who however assumes that the written fixation of the book took place in the 4th or 3rd century. The first to propose a *post-exilic* date was *Vatke*<sup>2</sup>), who placed the book in the first half of the 5th century. Nowadays most scholars think of the time *after Nehemiah*, ca. 400.<sup>3</sup>).

Many arguments have, however, the character of *argumenta e silentio*. The Northern kingdom is not mentioned, nor the institution of the monarchy. Positively important is the leading rôle played by the *priests* in the first chapters. In 1,13–14 it is manifestly the priests who are called upon by the prophet to assemble the *elders* and sanctify the fast. This does not agree with 1 Kings 21, where the fast is organized by the latter, the queen being the secret instigator. This points to a date, when the priests were the leaders of society, and strengthens the *argumentum e silentio* concerning the absence of kingship<sup>4</sup>). The same is the case in 2,15–17, where the prophet obviously enumerates every sort of people in the country<sup>5</sup>), without omitting anybody whom it might concern. If monarchy were in existence at the time of Joel, the king must have been mentioned in a such passage.

But still more decisive arguments can be drawn from the history of literature and religion.

*Merx* tried to prove that both 1–2 and 3–4 *linguistically* and *ideologically* depend upon other literature, especially *Ezekiel*. The stereotyped use of the

<sup>1</sup>) *Credner*, *Der Prophet Joel* (1831) pp. 41 ff.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 12.

<sup>3</sup>) *Kuenen*, *Merx*, cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 575 f., who descends to ca. 350.

<sup>4</sup>) against *Kapelrud*, esp. p. 48 f., who explains away the argument from 1,13–14, although he concedes that the procedure in Joel seems to be later than 1 Kings. 21. – On pp. 35 ff. *Kapelrud* is right in eliminating 1,9 from the array of arguments for a later date, and he also rightly does away with many linguistic arguments, partly because in some cases we are now able to prove that words, mostly found in later OT literature, existed in Canaan at much earlier days, e.g. in the Ras Shamra texts. And he also has stressed – rightly – that the call to penance and repentance as a cultic rite does not belong exclusively to post-exilic days – see especially pp. 81 ff. 19th century criticism had not much understanding for the “personal” religious elements in ritual. But on the other hand, this is no new discovery of *Kapelrud*. His teacher *Mowinkel*, e.g. in his famous *Psalmenstudien*, has shown quite another attitude.

<sup>5</sup>) against *Kapelrud*, cf. his words p. 187. The emuneration resembles Neh. 8,2 ff.

*cliché* “*The Northern*” as an eschatological term denoting the locusts is in this respect significant. This seems to place the book later than Ez. 38–39.

*Kapelrud*’s—in many respects very valuable—excursus on the expression has not weakened the fact that in Joel this expression is what I call a “*cliché*”, a slogan, most probably formed on the basis of the description of the enemy from the North in Jeremiah and Zephaniah, just as the “Remnant of Israel” rests upon, but re-interprets, concepts from the preaching of Isaiah. This means that Joel like Ez. 38–39 belongs to post-exilic days. There is a striking difference between the way in which e.g. Jeremiah speaks of the foe from the North, and the *cliché* used by Joel (against *Kapelrud*, p. 108). The word is used as an expression which everybody would understand. It contains an allusion which was meant to be understood by the prophet’s hearers. — On p. 148 *Kapelrud* will show that Joel 4,2f. and Ez. 39,28 cannot be interdependent, and that this must have consequences for the usual argument based on this interdependence. But the difference between the two passages leads to the hypothesis that Joel is later than Ez. 39. For the nationalistic spirit of the Joel-passage does not suit well the period to which *Kapelrud* assigns Joel (ca. 600). The conception in Ez. 38–39, that Yahweh has himself led Israel into captivity, is more in agreement with 6th century texts.

3,1 seems to depend upon Ez. 36,26–28 and 39,29; 4,18 upon Ez. 47,1. Joel also seems to assume a time of bliss between the deliverance (2,18–3,5) and the final judgment (4,1ff.), like the Book of Ezekiel.<sup>1)</sup> — A monotheism so clearly defined as in 2,27 we do not meet before Is. II.

It is true that such “Deutero-Isaianic” phrases may be derived from the style of psalms. But the first evidence of this use of the phrases as confessions of the faith in monotheism we seem to meet in Deutero-Isaiah. Not the phrase, but the theological use of it in the proclamation of strict monotheism is post-exilic.

The mentioning of *Jawan* (the Ionians) in 4,6 probably places the book in a late period, even if archaeological evidence shows the Ionians as known in the Near East in 8th century Assyrian inscriptions<sup>2)</sup>.

We have no certain evidence of inimical relations between Jews and Ionians before the exile (cf. the parallel passage Amos 1,9). And 4,6 suits the situation of the post-

<sup>1)</sup> It should perhaps also be noted that *Kapelrud* in many places exhibits a strong tendency to minimize the “eschatological” element in Joel — when he argues against the “apocalyptic” interpretation of especially chs. 3–4. — But it is evident that 2,18ff. prophesies the blessings connected with the impending day of Yahwe, just as e.g. Haggai in the last sections of his book. The whole picture of the future in 3–14 is therefore of a kind which seems to be more akin to the manner of Is. II than to the descriptions of the future given by the pre-exilic prophets. When similar compilations are found e.g. in Is. 10,5–12,6, they are of late date, as seen by the elements (Is. 11,11ff.) which can be referred to post-exilic days with certainty. Joel is a compilation of the same kind. When, however, we do not find it necessary to dispute the unity of the book, and in this respect *Kapelrud* agrees with me, then it becomes most probable that the book is post-exilic.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. also *Albright*, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 259.

exilic centuries – as described by *Kapelrud*, p. 157 – better than the pre-exilic days. For it speaks of *Phoenician* trade, which was favoured by the Persians at the cost of the Ionians. Here *Kapelrud* draws wrong conclusions from his historical premises. Especially his descriptions of conditions after 386 favours the late date of the passage.

The manner in which 4,2,11 speak of “all nations”, “all heathen”, is best understood in later ages, pre-exilic prophets mostly speaking of one single nation crushed by Yahweh. This holds good even over against a passage like Is. 8,9–11<sup>1</sup>). The pre-exilic prophets do not resemble Pss. 2 or 110 in this respect<sup>2</sup>). Accordingly the late date of the fixation preferred by *Kapelrud* might well coincide with activity of the prophet.

Besides the *literature* already mentioned, cf. also *Holzinger* in ZATW 1889, pp. 88 ff. (on the language) – often rightly criticized by *Kapelrud*, who however does not always draw the proper conclusions from his good arguments. – Too often he concludes that when new evidence has proved that a word in Joel is not necessarily late usage, then it must speak for the early date of Joel. The only admissible conclusion must be that linguistic evidence is inconclusive. S. R. Driver, *The Books of Joel and Amos* (1898). On traditional, Canaanite elements in the language of the book, see *Hvidberg*, *Graad og Løfter i det gamle Testamente* (1938), pp. 120 ff., and the Joel-studies of *Kapelrud*, the latter, however, also here to be read with caution, because he often goes too far in assuming that the undertones of the words, marked by Baalism, were understood by the people<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. my commentary on Is., I, p. 69 f. Isaiah speaks here of many nations, but all of them as part of the host of the concrete enemy of his day. In Joel it is different. Here the nations form a compact, but nevertheless inconcrete whole. Both passages may rest on ancient cult-texts. But the use is characteristically different.

<sup>2</sup>) against *Kapelrud*, p. 159 f. – The pre-exilic prophets seem to have carried the “historification” of the “cult-mythological” enemies farther than the post-exilic prophets. This is perhaps due to the historical situation. The pre-exilic prophets faced an enemy (Assyria) which was so extremely “real” that the collection of *gōjīm* in the cult-prophetic oracles (Pss. 2 and 110) was reduced to this singular foe. After 538 the Jews face a world power of greater dimensions, the government of which generally treated them well, while the concrete enemies again were small neighbours (Moab, Ammon, and above all, Edom – cf. e.g. Malachi. Therefore the eschatological language again took up the slogans inherited from the cultic oracles, these being of a more general character, suiting the situation. Certainly the reaction of prophets and priests (*Kapelrud*, p. 160) against kingship also was more than a reaction against the king’s personal position. It was part of the whole anti-Canaanite reaction, and so also directed against the royal ideology (cf. my *Messias–Moses redivivus–Menschensohn*, p. 70; *Det sakrale kongedømme*, p. 119).

<sup>3</sup>) Instar omnium I point to his treatment of *nīkerat* in 1,5 and of the entire verse, where he (p. 26) finds many “hidden or open” allusions to the phenomena which are part of the fertility cult. I cannot find one single word of which it is “apparent” that in this context it must allude to other things than the havoc wrought by the locusts. In many places *Kapelrud* assumes a knowledge of history of religions on the part of Joel’s contemporaries, which seems simply overwhelming. Cf. also my reflections at the conclusion of my contribution to the *Festschrift for Bertholet*.



– But *Kapelrud* is right in assuming an *historical plague of locusts* as the starting-point of the prophet's preaching, against *Engnell*, *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk I* (1948). – In *Cult and Prophetic word* (*Studia Theologica IV*, 1) *Kapelrud* has explained his points of view very well.

### *The Prophet.*

### AMOS

The book is named after a man, described in the superscription 1,1, cf. 7,14, as a *shepherd from Tekoa* in Judah, ca. 20 km. South of Jerusalem. The name 'āmōs is in the OT only connected with this prophet. The difference between 1,1 (*nōkēd*, a shepherd) and 7,14 (an owner of oxen, *bōkēr*) may be irrelevant, as he may have owned both kinds of cattle<sup>1</sup>). According to 7,14 he also understood the treatment of the fruits of the sycomore-trees. He repudiates the idea that he should need money for his work as a *nābī*<sup>1</sup>. This is of importance for the understanding of Amos's consciousness of his vocation. He knows it as the will of God that he must be a prophet; it is not something which he has been taught or inherited.

The only event which is known from his life beside his vocation, alluded to – probably – in the series of visions in ch. 7–9, is the controversy with the priest *Amaziah* at Bethel (ch. 7,10–17). Here we learn that his prophecies of doom led to a denunciation for attacks upon the security of the king and the state and consequently to his expulsion from the sanctuary. His activity as a prophet was not carried out in his native country Judah, but in the Northern kingdom. Other oracles are directed against the Bethel sanctuary, but also against Gilgal (near Jericho) and Beersheba, which in spite of its situation in the far South of Palestine seems to have attracted many pilgrims from North Israel, and against the Northern capital Samaria.

According to the superscription 1,1 his activity must be dated to the age of *Jeroboam II* and *Uzziah*. As he latter is named first the book must have been compiled in Judah. The addition which dates his preaching as taking place “two years before the earthquake”, also alluded to in Zech. 14,5, gives us no closer information, the absolute date of this event being unknown to

<sup>1</sup>) *Eissfeldt*, p. 440, n. 2. The English Version veils the difference (“herdsman”) used as translation in both passages. That *nōkēd* in 7,14 has some *cultic* significance (cf. Ugaritic *rb nkdm*, *Montgomery*, *Record and Revelation*, ed. *Wheeler Robinson* (1938), p. 22; *Halder*, *Associations of Cult Prophets* (1945), pp. 79 and 112), is at variance with the context expressly stating that Amos has nothing to do with the cult staff. He does not decline the title *nabī* (*Rowley*, in the *Eissfeldt-Festschrift* rightly maintains this against assertions to the contrary), but his words say that he was a common “herdsman and gatherer of sycomore fruit”. If the first expression is *cultic*, the second should also be considered as such. But both would be against the most natural understanding of the text. The same is true of *bōkēr* (against *Engnell*, *Studies in Divine Kingship*, p. 87; *Kapelrud*, *op. cit.*, p. 134; *M. Bič*, in *Vetus Testamentum* (1951), pp. 293; *Murtonen*, *ibid.* 1952, pp. 170f.

us. But this note proves that the book was composed not very long after the event. The conclusion is not quite certain, because the date may rest on a tradition living for a long time in the circle of his disciples, also after the exact date had been forgotten. But the oracle 7,9, alluding to the House of Jeroboam, affirms the broad outline of the superscription. The book seems to reflect materially prosperous conditions in the history of the Northern kingdom (6,13; 5,18: 6,1; cf. 2 Ki. 14,23—29). The date of his activity therefore may be given as approximately 760 or 750 B.C.

### *Contents and Composition.*

The book has 9 chapters.

1,2—2,16 contains a speech, introduced by a — probably traditional-cultic formula (cf. Joel 4,16; Jer. 25,30—31). The speech is modelled on a cultic pattern, resembling the ritual behind the Egyptian Execration Texts. It is a speech cursing first the neighbours of Israel, then Israel itself. The original ritual aimed at a ritual purge of the world and the people<sup>1)</sup>. — 3,1—6,14 contains a series of words, some of which are introduced by "Hear!" (3,1—5,6), others by "Woe!" (5,7—6,14). — 7,1—9,4 brings a narrative of some visions, seen by the prophet. This series is supplemented from another series, containing words of the prophet, and the narrative of visions is interrupted very awkwardly by the narrative of the controversy between Amos and the priest at Bethel (7,10—17), separating the three first of the five visions from the rest. 8,4—14 gives a second series of words introduced by "Hear!" After a hymnic fragment (9,5—6) follows in 9,7—10 one of the most violent oracles of doom in the book: Israel in the eyes of Yahweh is of no more value than Kushites, Philistines, and Aramaeans, and the Exodus from Egypt is a migration, certainly led by Yahweh, but in the same manner he has guided other nations to their present places of the world. The book ends in 9,11—15 with a promise of restitution of "the tabernacle of David that is fallen" and of fertility beyond all measure, the return of the Paradise.

From this we must infer that the book had been transmitted in a form, in which original complexes of tradition have been broken asunder and combined with other collections. The series of visions has been exploded by a narrative and some oracles. On formal grounds (the introductions "Hear!") it has been concluded that these oracles originally belonged to the similar complex in 3,1—5,6. The narrative of Amos and Amaziah has evidently been placed where it now stands by a compiler, because the words combined with the third vision, speaking of the house of Jeroboam (7,9), gave a catchword

<sup>1)</sup> cf. my paper, read to The Congress of OT Scholars at Leiden 1951 (*Oudtestamentische Studiën* VIII, pp. 85ff.). — Generally v. 2 is considered a sort of "motto" of "secondary" character, Pfeiffer, p. 578. Bertholet, in the *Bonwetsch-Festschrift* (1918), pp. 1ff., quoted by Eissfeldt, p. 441, n. 1, thinks that it is an echo of the vocation of the prophet. The word seems to be a stereotyped term (*Mowinkel*, in the Norwegian translation ad. loc.).

calling up the story of the denunciation for *crimen laesae majestatis*. But how tradition came to place the words of the book as they stand now, we cannot tell. 1,2-2,16 is an original composition by the prophet, even if the authenticity of some of the strophes is contested by many critics. The collections characterized by introductions like "Hear!" and "Woe!" have perhaps been connected on the catchword-principle. *Engnell* counts the book to the *diwān-type*. I am inclined to assume relations to the *liturgy-pattern*.<sup>1)</sup>

### *Authenticity and Integrity.*

The main part of the book indicates through its contents clearly its connection with the period in which Amos is said to have acted as a prophet. That Amos himself should have dictated the book cannot be proved. A composition as 1,2-2,16 has ultimately been arranged – orally – by himself with the purpose of alluring his listeners by the denunciations of unpopular neighbours, before the lightning hits Israel itself. We have to count upon both oral and later scribal tradition.

*Secondary sections* have been assumed in 1,9-10, so slavishly imitating the preceding strophe, in 1,11-12, thought to presuppose the evil acts of Edom towards Judah in 587, and in the deuteronomistically phrased strophe on Judah, 2,4-5. The three *doxologies*, 4,13; 5,8-9; 9,5-6, of which at least the two verses in ch. 5 seem to interrupt a context, are widely supposed to be additions. But 4,13 might well be understood as concluding the preceding dramatic threatening words<sup>2)</sup>.

The conclusion of the book, 9,11-15, is mostly rejected by the critics.<sup>3)</sup> The arguments for this are as follows. It is noted that with *v. 8* there already can be heard a clear change in the tone, the punishment no longer being directed against everybody as 9,1-4, but only "the sinful kingdom" (Northern Israel), and there is no talk of complete destruction of the people. *V. 9* only speaks of a purge, and *v. 10* correspondingly says that the *sinner*s shall die by the sword – apparently a corrective to *v. 1*. And from *v. 11* we have clear promises of happiness. Above all the expression "*the tabernacle of David that is fallen*" in *v. 11* is considered an evident proof of the *post-exilic origin* of the passage, and in like manner the words of *v. 15* are understood of the *return from the exile*.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. Oudtest. Stud. VIII, p. 97, and on the mechanics of oral tradition, *Birkeland*, Traditionsvesen, pp. 67ff., and *Mowinkel*, in his translation, p. 620f.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Horst*, Die Doxologien im Amosbuch, ZATW 1929, pp. 45ff. *Hammershaimb*, in his commentary (1946), ad. loc. defends the originality of all the doxologies.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. the classical sentences of *Wellhausen's* commentary.



*Hammershaimb* stresses, rightly, that it is not possible dogmatically to declare all promises of future happiness to be post-exilic. And he points out that Amos as a Judaeen prophet must have been rooted in the expectations centred around the Davidic dynasty. He may therefore have considered the House of David as "fallen", because it had lost the position which it had occupied in David's own time, not as a consequence of the events of 587, which he has not seen. And having threatened the people with deportation, he can also have predicted a return to the land. He may also have assumed that Judah would be involved in the catastrophe (H. thinks it possible that 2,4-5 is genuine). But he can at least have expected that after the final punishment the Southern kingdom will be the leading factor as in the time of David.

It must be added that the expression in v. 14 *w<sup>e</sup>šabti ʾeth-s<sup>e</sup>būt* – must not necessarily be taken as pointing to the exile<sup>1</sup>). But on the other hand I cannot help hearing Deutero-Isaiah and especially *Joel*<sup>2</sup>) in the expressions<sup>3</sup>) e.g. in the words of the rebuilding of the desolate cities. Another point in favour of a post-exilic date is the way in which *Edom* is talked of, in the usual stereotyped manner, known from late prophets as *Malachi*, *Is.* 11,14 and other similar passages. And above all, the words of 11ff. are so opposite in tone and ideas to the rest of the book, that I think that *Wellhausen* must be right in his famous verdict on the verses. At least, Amos cannot have said this in Bethel without making himself a laughing stock to the hearers, not even if modern theories of the "ambivalence of feelings" are taken into account<sup>4</sup>). It may be admitted against older theories that the pre-exilic prophets may very well have nourished hopes of better times in spite of their gloomy outlook, but it cannot be assumed that they made their ejaculations of doom and of blessings so near to one another. Amos has a "perhaps" (5,15)<sup>5</sup>), which may have been the nucleus around which his disciples might

<sup>1</sup>) cf. the article of *Baumann* in ZATW 1928.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Kapelrud*, *Joel-studies* (1948), p. 24.

<sup>3</sup>) *Engnell*, *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk* I, (1948) assumes that the conclusion of the book, like the doxologies, is an old cultic messianic poem; consequently neither the doxologies nor the concluding prophecy can be *verba ipsissima* of Amos, but must belong to wider traditional material, taken over by the "congregation" of Amos. – This shows how premature E's verdict is that it is not possible to distinguish *verba ipsissima* from "additions". – Certainly there is a similarity between Amos 9,13 and Ps. 65 (*Kapelrud*, loc. cit.). But in my opinion this points to the conclusion, that the passage in the prophet as usual is dependent upon more ancient psalm-styles, as in Deutero-Isaiah.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. *Engnell*, *Profetia och tradition*, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1947, p. 124f.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. I, p. 201.

evolve more elaborate speeches of promise,<sup>1)</sup> just as in the case of Isaiah.

*Literature:* Commentaries outside the series: Michelet (1893). Cripps (1929). Hammershaimb (1946). Weiser, Die Prophetie des Amos (1929). Lindblom, Die literarische Gattung der prophetischen Literatur (1924), pp. 66ff. Rowley, Was Amos a nabi? in the Festschrift for Eissfeldt (1947), pp. 191 ff. – Sören Holm, Profeten Amos (Kirken og Tiden, 1938, fasc. VII, pp. 193–205). – Maag, Text, Wortschatz und Begriffswelt des Buches Amos (1951) I have not seen.

## OBADIAH

The short chapter is called in a superscription “*The vision of Obadiah*”. The Hebrew name (rendered in Greek, *Abdias* or *Obdias*, in Latin, *Abdias*) means “Servant of Yahweh”. On the person of the prophet we get no information. The name must not necessarily be understood as a later pseudonymous designation of the book (cf. Malachi), for it is also used by other persons in the OT.

The contents of the chapter are prophecies against Edom, motivated by Edom’s “violence against his brother Jacob” (v. 10f.). The oracles remind us strongly of the stereotyped curses against Edom which we find in nearly all literature after 587, cf. Lam. 4,21–22; Ps. 137,7; Is. 34,5 ff.; Ez. 35,1 ff.; 25,12 ff.; Mal. 1,2 ff. Vv. 2–10 are repeated in Jer. 49,7–22.

Wellhausen understood vv. 2–9 not as a curse, but as a description of the calamities of Edom in the 5th century, and accordingly dated the prophecies from this time. The dating being on other grounds probable, Wellhausen’s understanding of the verses not as curse but as description is nevertheless not the right one<sup>2)</sup>. The most cautious line to take is to assign the book to the time between 587, the fall of Jerusalem, and 312, when the capital of the land of Edom, Petra, according to Diodorus Siculus (XIX, 94) was in the hand of the Arabs, while Southern Judah (ibid. XIX, 98) was called Idumaea<sup>3)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> That a “remnant” is supposed to remain after the doom (Engnell, Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk I (1948)) is doubtful, when we remember 3,12, which describes the “remnant” as the remnants of an animal torn asunder by a lion. This “remnant” is quite another thing than the “remnant” of Isaiah. In 5,15 the “remnant” seems to be the actual Israel, as it was in the 8th century, after the devastating wars against Aram, not the “remnant” which shall be left over from judgment. It is possible that Amos has regarded conversion as a possibility. But he has not expressed it very explicitly.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. Eissfeldt and Pfeiffer. The latter thinks that 2–9 depicts the Edomites’ flight “to the border” under the pressure of the Arabian (Nabataean) invasion which had not yet run its course in 460. Pfeiffer thinks that this applies to 1–9 + 10–14 and 15b, while 15a + 16–21, belonging to the realm of apocalyptic fancies, partly (16–18) are later, but still earlier than Joel. 19–21 he refers to the first part of the 4th century (v. 19 taken as an allusion to the Samaritans).

<sup>3)</sup> cf. Haller, in RGG, and Pfeiffer.

The unity of the book is disputed<sup>1)</sup>. *Rudolph*<sup>2)</sup> only assumes two sections, both belonging to the same prophet. The relations between Ob. and Jer. 49 are not clear<sup>3)</sup>. *Pfeiffer* perhaps rightly asserts that even if we allow for "wilful changes and accidental corruption, neither of the two texts, as we have them, could be derived from the other". – Both recensions may be derived from a lost original, cf. e.g. Ob. 8 and Jer. 49,7 which seem to be taken from a common source, probably in oral tradition. At all events, the relationship with Jer. 49 is quite irrelevant for a dating of Ob., because it is not sure that Jer. 49 comes from the mouth of Jeremiah (*Pfeiffer*)<sup>4)</sup>.

Obadiah belongs to the "nationalistic" prophets. As *Pfeiffer* rightly observes, his passionate cry for vengeance is diametrically opposed to the spirit of self-sacrifice for the benefit of mankind. Obadjahu is no 'Ebed Yahweh in the sense of Is. 53.

## JONAH

### Contents.

This book is different from the other prophetic books, being exclusively a *narrative*, in 4 chapters, of the *disobedient prophet* who is compelled by Yahweh to preach doom to Nineveh.

As his preaching makes the people of Nineveh repent their sins and so win forgiveness, he murmurs against Israel's "gracious, merciful God, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repenting himself of the evil" (4,2). God therefore has to teach his prophet that he is a God who loves all, also the heathen who are as children "that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand", and the cattle too.

### The Prophet.

The prophet is called "*Jonah the son of Amittai*". He is the only person bearing this name in the OT. In 2 Ki. 14,25 we hear that he came from *Gath-hepher* (*ḥirbet ez-zerra* near *el-mešhed*, ca. 5 km. NNE of Nazareth), and we are told that he predicted the victories of Jeroboam II<sup>5)</sup>. To the legendary material on this prophet belongs the present book.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. e.g. the commentary of *Robinson* (in *Eissfeldt's Handbuch*), dividing the chapter into 7 sections from different periods, all after 587.

<sup>2)</sup> ZATW 1931, pp. 222 ff.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. on Jeremiah, p. 121.

<sup>4)</sup> Against *Sellin*, who on this basis combined Ob. 1–10 with 2 Ki. 8,20–22.

<sup>5)</sup> On later legends, see *Nestle*, *Marginalien* (1893), pp. 24f., 55f., and *Rabbinic material* in *Strack-Billerbeck* I, pp. 642 ff., II, p. 705; IV, p. 266. His tomb is shown in several places in Syria and Palestine and near the ruins of Nineveh (cf. *Marti*, p. 241).



### *Authenticity.*

The book does not claim to be composed by the prophet himself. Formally it therefore belongs to *the legends of prophets*<sup>1)</sup>, containing a well-known fairy tale motive<sup>2)</sup>. It is therefore impossible to raise the question of "authenticity", the author being unknown.

### *Integrity.*

Setting aside a few glosses there is only one element in the book which does not fit well into its tale, viz. the *psalm* in ch. 2. It is a psalm of *thanksgiving*, praising Yahweh for salvation from death<sup>3)</sup>, but we should – in this chapter – expect a psalm of lamentation. It has nothing to do with a salvation from dangers at sea – as the interpolator may have meant<sup>4)</sup>. If the author of the book had composed the psalm, he would certainly have created a poem more in accord with his narrative. He therefore must have taken it over from some collection of psalms.

Some scholars<sup>5)</sup> have attempted a separation of "documents" in the book, but it has not been accepted by the majority<sup>6)</sup>.

### *The Date.*

The book is hardly pre-exilic. The *universalism*, describing Yahweh's love, not only to Israel, but even to Israel's enemy, the hated Nineveh, cannot be thought of in pre-exilic times, where the words of Jeremiah 29,7 stand as quite singular. Nineveh and its empire clearly belong to a distant past (3,3). The city is described as so enormous that it cannot depend upon a true memory<sup>7)</sup>. The *language* too is of a late type, reminding us of Eccles., and like this book abounding in *Aramaisms*. The double name of God in 4,6, reminding us of Gen. 2 and outside the creation story only used by Jonah, perhaps testifies to dependence upon Gen.

### *Historical Character of the Book.*

The Book of Jonah was above provisionally described as a *prophet-legend*. But the material embodied in it shows that it rests upon legends of different

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 238 f.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 241 f.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 153 f., cf. p. 163. *Johnson*, in *Studies* . . . pres. to Robinson (1950).

<sup>4)</sup> "Im Bauch des Fisches wächst auch kein Seegras" (*Wellhausen*).

<sup>5)</sup> *Böhme*, ZATW 1887, pp. 224 ff.; *Hans Schmidt*, ZATW 1905, pp. 285 ff., *Jona* (1907) cf. RGG.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. *Marti*, p. 243, and *Eissfeldt*, p. 451 f.

<sup>7)</sup> cf. *Robinson*, pp. 123 ff.

sorts. A motive, known from some of the prophets, viz. their resistance to their vocation (Jer. I, cf. Exod. 3,11ff.)<sup>1)</sup> has been combined with a *fairy-tale motive*, known all over the world, of men being swallowed by great sea-monsters<sup>2)</sup>.

To deny the historical character of the book, because it contains some features of improbable character (the sojourn in the belly of the monster; cf. the fasting of the cattle (3,6)), is not necessarily a symptom of disbelief in the possibility of miracle. From apologetic quarters many attempts have been made to prove that men may be swallowed by animals of the sea. Setting aside the rationalistic element in such explaining away of miracle, we must say that on closer inspection at least one example has turned out a sailor's yarn, naïvely accepted by credulous theologians<sup>3)</sup>.

The maintenance of the historicity of the story, in many circles a proof of orthodoxy, is of course accounted for by the use of the story in Mt. 12, 40, where the "sign of Jonah" is interpreted as designating the sojourn of Jonah in the belly of the sea-monster. But this verse is not found in the parallel tradition in Lk. 11,30, where "the sign of Jonah" is the preaching of Jonah. This also suits the context better than the verse in Mt., which accordingly is considered an interpolation, interpreting the words of Jesus in another way than the original. In principle we have to stress that the vocation of Jesus as saviour must have prevented him from having other opinions than those held by his contemporaries.

The book has also been regarded as an *allegory*. "Jonah", "the dove" (Ps. 74,19; Hos. 7,11; 11,11; cf. also Ps. 68,14), is thought to be Israel, that should bring the message of God to the nations. It failed to do so and was accordingly swallowed by Babel, cf. Jer. 51,34,44, and delivered from exile by its conversion. But it was dissatisfied, because Yahweh did not punish the heathen, and only reluctantly dedicated itself to its task. In this way the great monster is interpreted as a symbol, not as a real sea-monster<sup>4)</sup>. But allegory here as nearly always is arbitrary, as when the miraculous plant in ch. 4 is considered a symbol for Zerubbabel. In Jer. 51 the identification of Babel and the mythical sea-monster is expressly mentioned in the text.<sup>5)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 450.

<sup>2)</sup> *Frobenius*, *Die Weltanschauung der Naturvölker* (1893); *Aus den Flegeljahren der Menschheit* (1901); *Das Zeitalter des Sonnengottes* (1904); cf. *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 1900, p. 378. *Radermacher*, *Walfischmythen* (*ibid.*, pp. 251 ff.). *Hans Schmidt*, *Jona* (1907). *Stollberg*, *Jona* (1927), I have not seen.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. the commentary of *Bewer*, p. 5.

<sup>4)</sup> *Cheyne*, *Theol. Review* (1877), pp. 211-19, cf. the interpretation of G. A. Smith, who treats the story as a "parable or allegory" (*The Book of the Twelve Prophets II* (1928), p. 488).

<sup>5)</sup> cf. *Bewer*, p. 10.

The truth of the allegorical interpretation is that the story aims at *instruction*. The author combined this instruction with the prophet known from 2 Ki. 14,25, and he will lead his hearers to see and refrain from their narrow particularism.<sup>1)</sup> The book therefore gets a character of *parable*. *Bewer* rightly compares it with the parable of the Good Samaritan. – In early Christianity (pictures in the catacombs) it was used as a symbol of resurrection of the dead – a motive found in the material underlying the psalm in ch. 2<sup>2)</sup>.

*Commentaries* in the usual series. A peculiar interpretation of the fish from the cuneiform symbol for Nineveh is given by C. J. Ball in Proceedings of the Society of Bibl. Archaeology 1898, pp. 9ff., cf. Oesterley and Robinson, Intro., p. 378f. – F. A. Rayner, The Story of Jonah: an Easter Study (The Evang. Quarterly 1950, pp. 123ff.).

### MICAH

#### *The Prophet.*

The book, consisting of 7 chapters, carries the name of *Micah*, abbreviated from *mikājāhū* or *mikājāh* (Jer. 26,18, ketib), common Hebrew name. The best known other bearer of the name is the earlier prophet who predicted the death of Ahab (1 Ki. 22), Micaiah the son of Imlah.

According to the superscription 1,1 the author of the prophecies of our book came from a town named *Moreseth*, probably *Moreseth-Gath* (1,14), perhaps a place near the old well-known Philistine town of *Gath*<sup>3)</sup>. The prophet apparently was a man from the countryside like Amos, and an ardent critic of the greater cities, in his eyes the curse of the country (1,15ff.).

The superscription *dates* his words to the time of the kings of Judah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, i.e. he is a contemporary of Isaiah. This information is, in the case of Hezekiah, testified through the important quotation of Micah 3,12 in Jer. 26,18. The polemic against Samaria further shows that the prophet had begun his work before the fall of that city in 721. The dates of the superscription are accordingly confirmed, at least in broad outline.

Concerning the *personal life* of this prophet we otherwise learn nothing, if we do not conclude from 2,11, cf. 3,5–8, that he, like Amos, did not belong to the organized *nēbī'im*.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. Engnell, Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk: "He represents consciously universalism, he makes front against Judaic particularism".

<sup>2)</sup> Engnell, Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk. – The word Mt. 12,39ff. I do not consider an original word of Jesus (cf. above), but nevertheless Engnell may be right in assuming connections with the ideas of the descensus ad inferos in the Psalms (cf. vol. I, pp. 147f., 155ff.).

<sup>3)</sup> Jeremias, PJB 1933, pp. 42ff.; Elliger, ZDPV 1934, pp. 81ff.; Noth, Josua, p. 49; Abel, Géographie de la Paléστine II, p. 392.



A closer dating may be found in the fact that 1,10-16 probably presupposes the political independent existence of *Gath*. This would mean that the passage originated in the time before this town was sacked by Sargon in 711<sup>1)</sup>, while 1,3-6 seems to be earlier, perhaps from ca. 724, the time of the last insurrection of the Northern kingdom against Asshur. It is doubtful whether any word of Micah brings us near to the invasion of Sennacherib in 701.

### *Contents and Authenticity.*

The arrangement of the words in the book may be indicated in this manner:

1-3: Prophecies of doom; 4-5: promises; 6,1-7,6: doom; 7,7-20: promises<sup>2)</sup>).

The origin of all this material from the prophet Micah is disputed. Most critics agree that 1-3 essentially come from him, because these chapters clearly suit the situation given by the superscription. An exception is 2,12-13, which belong to the kind of promises found in 4,1-5,8. The problem is, if a prophecy of weal as 2,12-13 can be reconciled with a threat like 3,12 - not to speak of 4,1ff. At least, people seem to have remembered Micah as predicting the destruction of the temple (Jer. 26,18<sup>3)</sup>). This affects the promises of the book as a whole and makes the origin from Micah unsafe. But against this much may be adduced in favour of their belonging to the *time* of Micah or at least to the time shortly after his days (the reign of Manasseh). Most of the material in 4-5 evidently comes from an *anti-Assyrian*, nationalistic milieu (5,4-5). This circle is related to the circle of Isaiah's disciples<sup>4)</sup>. Only 2,12-13, 4,6-7, and 5,6-7 seem to be of *exilic* origin.

Similar considerations may be advanced concerning 6-7, which Mowinkel<sup>5)</sup> regards as an independent collection. If the book had been conceived as a whole, we should expect the great promises of 4-5 at the end of the book, while the passage 7,8-20, where we have only hope and prayer for help and deliverance, would have been in a more suitable place earlier in the book. This indicates that 6-7 is an independent collection. Setting aside 7,8-20 these chs. mostly are of the same *pre-exilic* type as chs. 1-3. Mowinkel refers to the idea of sacrificing the children (6,7) as an expression of the exaggerated

<sup>1)</sup> cf. Robinson's commentary, p. 128.

<sup>2)</sup> The arrangement mentioned vol. I, p. 258f.

<sup>3)</sup> Eissfeldt, p. 457. Pfeiffer also suspects 1,1-5a (p. 590), but this seems uncertain. Then the opening words of Is. might as well be considered secondary.

<sup>4)</sup> Mowinkel, *Jesajadispielen* (1926), refers to the fact that Is. 2,2-4 has also been ascribed to Micah (4,1-4).

<sup>5)</sup> Besides the book mentioned n. 4. cf. also his introduction and commentary in the Norwegian translation, vol. III.

cultic zeal characteristic of the time of Manasseh, and to 6,16 as a precursor of the deuteronomistic formula "to walk in all the ways of Jeroboam the son of Nebat". But it is also possible that 6,16 presupposes that Samaria still stands, the expression accordingly being earlier than 721. And the sacrifice of children may also be referred to the time of Ahaz (2. Ki 16,3 -<sup>1</sup>). That this material comes from Micah is however not a priori certain, because it may be referred to his times or to a time near to his days. There is a milder tone over the threats in 6-7, and *Mowinckel* thinks that 7,7 indicates that the judgement may be a preparation for salvation, while *Micah's* last word seems to have been the irrevocable oracle of doom 3,12. - The promises in 7,8ff. are built up as a *liturgy*<sup>2</sup>), an imitation of cultic compositions<sup>3</sup>). In this composition the fall of Jerusalem is alluded to in several places, probably as an event of the past, and the passage upon the whole reminds us strongly of the prophecies of the Fall of Babel.

The *text* of the book of Micah seems to be in a rather bad state in several places.

Besides the usual commentaries, see *Lindblom*, *Micah literarisch untersucht* (1929). *G. W. Anderson*, *A Study of Micah 6,1-8* (*Scottish Journal of Theology* 1951, pp. 191ff.).

#### NAHUM

The prophet *nahhum* according to the superscription was an *Elkoshite*, but the derivation of this word, probably telling of his birthplace, is unknown. The 3 chapters of the book contain *prophecies against Nineveh*.

The first chapter is generally thought to contain an *alphabetical hymn*. But the restoration of the acrostic is difficult. The rest of the book is a description of the fall of the Assyrian capital, of great poetical strength and beauty, a stirring expression of the relief spreading over the Near East as the expectation of the fall of the hated tyrant grew.

The expectation of the fall of Nineveh gives us as *terminus ante quem* the year 612 B. C. The *terminus post quem* according to 3,8ff. must be the Assyrian conquest of Thebes in 663. But inside this period we probably have to prefer the later part, when the rise of the Neo-Babylonian empire and the joint attempt of Babel and the Medes threatened Assyria, probably after 626, the year of the death of Asshurbanipal of Asshur and the ascension of Nabopolassar of Babylon. - To interpret the book as a liturgy for the enthronement-festival of Yahweh *after* the fall of Nineveh in 612<sup>4</sup>) has rightly been rejected

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 458.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 161 ff.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Gunkel*, (*Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 1923, pp. 48 ff.

<sup>4</sup>) *Humbert*, *ZATW* 1926, pp. 206 ff.; *Arch. f. Orientforschung* 1928, pp. 14 ff.; *Rev. de hist. et phil. rel.* 1932, pp. 1 ff.

by Eissfeldt<sup>1)</sup>. This would presuppose an uncertain interpretation and a textual conjecture in 1,9. But this only applies to the date, not to the theory that the book is a liturgy<sup>2)</sup>.

Haldar<sup>3)</sup> rejects the theory that the book is a liturgy and will prove that the book originated from a cultic circle, and seems inclined to interpret the name of the book as an allusion to the aim of the book (cf. 3,7 and 2,3). This circle used their knowledge of cultic texts in political activity against the enemies of Judah, the Assyrians, combining them with the foes conquered in ritual combat by the divine king in the New Year Festival. As proof Haldar adduces a vast amount of parallels from Mesopotamia and Ras Shamra. But his use of this material is often arbitrary and without real understanding of the OT text, which is necessary to ascertain whether the parallels really are parallels of true illuminative force. The broad outlines of his theory deserve attention. But probably this only means that the prophet used "historified" elements from the idea of God's fight with chaos at the creation of the world. That the enemy is not mentioned by name till 2,9 is a common feature in prophecy<sup>4)</sup>, and also quite natural, because the actual political enemy is identified with enemies conquered at the beginning of the world in the fight which is "re-lived" in the New Year Festival. To deny the existence of a prophet Nahum, or at least to doubt it, is not well founded<sup>5)</sup>.

The most probable idea is perhaps still that the book is a real prophecy of doom against Nineveh. This prophet belongs to the *nationalistic* prophets of the type attacked by Jeremiah. His cultic connection is proved through his use of psalm-forms. The words of Pfeiffer<sup>6)</sup>, that "there is nothing specifically religious in this outburst of joy over the inevitable downfall of the Assyrian Empire", cannot be taken as a correct description, owing to the fact, noted by Pfeiffer, that Yahweh occasionally threatens Nineveh (2,14; 3,5f.). The book has the character of a prophetic *curse* against the enemy and as such cannot be considered not religious.<sup>7)</sup> And further, it may be said that the joy over the fall of Nineveh is also an expression of gratitude for expected freedom from an enemy who has identified himself with Evil to such a degree that to curse him is a sort of profession of loyalty to Good. The book "has its own religiosity, and we do wrong to it by measuring it by the measure of prophecy of doom"<sup>8)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> Eissfeldt, p. 462.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 161f.

<sup>3)</sup> Studies in the Book of Nahum (1947).

<sup>4)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 146f.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. the criticism of Engnell, in Profetia och tradition, Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 1947, p. 128, n. 40, with arguments against the theory that the book is not a "liturgy".

<sup>6)</sup> p. 595.

<sup>7)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 138ff., on war poetry and its use.

<sup>8)</sup> Eissfeldt.



*Literature:* Besides the usual commentaries. cf. *Edelkoort*, *Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania, drie profeten voor onzen tijd* (1937). – If I should try to reconstruct something like a liturgy I would point to the introductory hymn (ch. 1), followed by the *invitation to a festival* (2,1), introducing the *curses* in 2–3. The place in life of a liturgy of this kind would presumably originally have been preparatory rites before a campaign (cf. vol. I, p. 140). This may have been “imitated” by our prophet in Assyrian times. But his “imitation” has of course been meant as seriously as an “original” liturgy.

## HABAKKUK

### *The Name of the Book.*

This small book (3 chapters), which through the Pauline use of 2,4 b (Rom. 1,17; Gal. 3,11, cf. Hebr. 10,38–1)) has gained a significant position in the history of theology, carries a name which in itself is a problem. The Hebrew form is *ḥabakkuk*, LXX writes *Ambakoim*, Vulg. *Habacuc*.

*Nöldeke*<sup>1)</sup> derived it from Arabic *ḥibikkatun*, “dwarf”. But *Noth*<sup>2)</sup> finds a derivation from an Accadian plant name, *ḥambakūku*, more probable<sup>3)</sup>.

On the person of the prophet we have no information. One of the apocryphal additions to the Book of Dan.<sup>4)</sup> tells an unhistorical legend of his relations with Daniel among the lions (Bel and the Dragon 33ff.). This story is in LXX (not in Theod.) assigned to “Ambakum, son of Jesus of the tribe of Levi”, and declared to be “taken from his prophecy”. From this tradition *Mowinckel* infers that, although being a *midrash* (a late devotional narrative), it perhaps has preserved a tradition concerning the prophet and his father, who accordingly were *Levites*<sup>5)</sup>. Further he concludes from the strong influence of psalm style upon the book that the prophet belonged to the *temple nabi*’s who had connection with the temple-singers and the authors of the psalms<sup>6)</sup>.

### *Composition and Date.*

*Mowinckel*<sup>8)</sup> says that this book is perhaps the book which has suffered most from exaggerated literary criticism. Of the 3 chapters *Marti*’s commentary

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *A. Nygren*, “Den rättfärdige skall leva av tro”. Ur ett bibelords historia genom två och ett halvt årtusende (Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift 1943, pp. 281 ff.).

<sup>2)</sup> *Encycl. Biblica*.

<sup>3)</sup> *Die isr. Personennamen* (1928), p. 231.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. also *Duhm*, *Das Buch Habakuk* (1906), pp. 6 and 11, after *Friedr. Delitzsch*.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. below, p. 230.

<sup>6)</sup> *Psalmstudien* III, p. 109 f.

<sup>7)</sup> op. cit. pp. 27 ff., cf. also *Balla* in *RGG*, 2nd ed., and *Sellin* in the 2nd ed. of his commentary. Behind the views of *Mowinckel* and *Balla* stand of course the ideas of history of literature of *Gunkel*.

<sup>8)</sup> *Jesajadisiplene*, p. 145.

only left 7 verses as "genuine". *Duhm* in the preface to his commentary<sup>1)</sup> says that *Marti* treats the book just as cruelly as *Yahweh* according to 3,13 will treat the house of the ungodly!

What has made the treatment so difficult to the critics is the exegetical problem, to determine the *enemy* denounced in the book, and the *dating* of the prophecy combined with this question. Is the brutal people of 1,12-17, whose downfall is predicted in ch. 2, the *Chaldaeans*? These are in 1,5-11 described as *Yahweh's* means of punishment towards Judah, like the *Assyrians* in Is. 10,5ff. They have now done more than they were bidden to do and therefore incur the punishment themselves. Or is the brutal people the *Assyrians*, now to be punished by the *Chaldaeans*? Against the latter idea speaks that not a single word indicates that 1,12-17 allude to another people than 1,5-11. *Budde*<sup>2)</sup> who is the most ardent advocate of the *Assyrian* theory tries to solve the difficulty by assuming that 1,5-11 have been misplaced, and removes the verses to a place after 2,4. *Duhm*, reacting against *Marti's* hyper-criticism, cuts the knot by altering the word *kasdim* in 1,6 to *kittim*, the *Greeks*! He therefore dates the book to the time of *Alexander the Great*. This hypothesis – built on a conjecture! – he supports by 1,9 describing the brutal people as marching *Eastwards*, which does not go well with the idea of the *Chaldaeans*, but suits the idea of *Duhm* very well. The two theories named first must lead to a date either after 609 or before 612. In the latter case the book is contemporary with and related to *Nahum*.

According to *Mowinckel's* earlier view<sup>3)</sup> the book is a unity from the *Chaldaean* period<sup>4)</sup>, a liturgy for a day of penitence<sup>5)</sup>. In his commentary in the Norwegian translation, vol. III, from 1944, he has modified his dating. He thinks that the godless tyrant is the *Assyrian* empire, which is to be supplanted by the *Chaldaeans*. The *book* accordingly must belong to the days of king *Josiah*, before the fall of *Nineveh* in 612, perhaps also before 616, when the assaults of the *Babylonians* and *Medes* on *Assyria* set in earnest. This appears not to have happened in the days of the prophecy of *Habakkuk*.

*Humbert* arranges the material in much the same way, but thinks that the *enemy* is king *Jehoiakim*, and that the liturgy was used to attack the syncre-

<sup>1)</sup> cf. above, p. 151, n. 4.

<sup>2)</sup> ZATW 1889, pp. 155ff. ThStKr 1894, pp. 57ff.

<sup>3)</sup> Jesajadisiplene, p. 147f.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. also *Cannon*, ZATW 1925, pp. 62ff. A detailed investigation on similar lines is also contained in book of *Humbert*, Problèmes du livre d'Habacuc (1944).

<sup>5)</sup> so also *Humbert*, op. cit. – *Engnell*, Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk, considers the book a real cultic liturgy presumably from the days of *Josiah* or *Jehoiakim*.

tism of his cultus. *Mowinckel* also has proposed to understand 1,2-4 as a reference to this king<sup>1</sup>), but he has later abandoned this idea. The difficulty of *Humbert's* idea lies in the assumption of an official liturgy for a service of intercession in 602-1 in the royal temple *attacking the king*. The book *imitates* a liturgy, and in that case a royal part might also be inserted.

#### Contents.

1 2-4: Lamentation on the ungodly rule. 1,5-11: Oracle answering the prayer. Yahweh will punish the enemy through the Chaldeans. 1, 12-17: Complaint against the tyrants. 2,1-5: God's answer: A tyranny must be exterminated, but "the just shall live by his faith"<sup>2</sup>). 2,6-16 + 20: A prophetic speech of doom against the tyrant. 2,18-19 *Mowinckel* considers later interpolations. The book is concluded by a *psalm*, 3,1-19, a prayer for the fulfilment of the preceding prophecies.

*Literature:* *Happel*, Das Buch des Propheten Habakuk (1900), would date the book to the Seleucid period. Against the late dating of *Duhm*, cf. also *Budde*, ZDMG 1930, pp. 129ff. *Edelkoort*, cf. p. 150. *Eissfeldt*, p. 471, *Lindblom*, Profetismen, pp. 248, 311, on Habakkuk as a temple-prophet. *Eissfeldt* notes that only Hab., Hag., and Zech. are called *nābī'* in the superscriptions of their books. — Among the manuscripts found in 1947 in Palestine (cf. above, p. 115) was also a scroll containing a commentary on Habakkuk. — *W. F. Albright*, The Psalm of Habakkuk (in Studies presented to T. H. Robinson (1950), p. 1ff.).

### ZEPHANIAH

#### Contents.

The book has 3 chapters threatening *Judah* for its ungodliness, especially its *imitation of foreign customs* in cult and morals (1,2ff.), but also predicts a *dies irae* (1,7,14ff.) over *all nations*, including *Assyria* (2,3-15). The book ends with a jubilation at the deliverance of Jerusalem.

#### The Prophet.

We do not know much of the prophet Zephaniah. His father is called *Cushi*, i.e. the Ethiopian, the Negro. This perhaps implies that he was of a slave family. To the temple personnel belonged slaves, given to the sanctuary (Ezr. 2, 43,55), who may have been foreigners. His familiarity with the cultic language (1,7,9; 2,1) also strengthens the assumption that he belonged to the circles of *temple-nabi's*.

<sup>1</sup>) Jesajadisiplene, p. 61. On p. 62 he also assumes reference to the Egyptian tyranny of *Necho* after 609. These ideas have however been dropped in the Norwegian translation III (1944); cf. also his review of *Humbert's* book, Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift 1947, p. 251; Svensk Exeg. Årsbok 1948, pp. 74f.

<sup>2</sup>) On the interpretation of this phrase, see the short comment by *Hebert*, The Authority of the Old Testament (1947), p. 85, and the article of *Nygren* mentioned p. 115, n. 1. — *Engnell* thinks that "The just one" is a designation of the *king* in the liturgy. — He has given good reasons for considering the Psalm in ch. 3 a "royal psalm" (note the shifting between "individual" and "collective" form, — cf. vol. I, p. 155).



*The Date.*

1,1 informs us that he preached during the reign of *Josiah*. This is confirmed by the hints at historical conditions, e.g. in 1,4, alluding to foreign cults, presumed to imply that he spoke before the reform of 621. For this also speaks the allusions to Assyria<sup>1</sup>).

*The Book.*

*Mowinkel*<sup>2</sup>) finds two main *complexes of traditions* in the book, 1-2 and 3, the first consisting of 7 or 8 single units, some of them, esp. 2,4-15, with some later additions, the latter of 3 smaller units.

The problem of *originality* or secondary material is generally raised regarding the conclusion with its hopeful outlook. It cannot be asserted *a priori* that Zeph. cannot have prophesied of salvation, for 3,8-13 counts upon a "remnant" (cf. Is.) purified in the coming judgment. But the ending of the book, on the other hand, works with stereotyped material, from which it is not very easy to draw sure conclusions.

Concerning the *name of the prophet* - also used of other OT persons - cf. *Noth*, *Personennamen*, p. 178; but cf. also the non-Israelite material in the commentary of *Powis Smith* (*Intern. Crit. Comm.*), p. 184, and *Eissfeldt*, *Baal Zaphon* (1932), pp. 2ff., proving that the name *spn* may be a divine name.

The theory that the prophet was of *royal descent* (cf. the name *Hezekiah* among his forefathers) has nothing reliable for its support. It is - it must be admitted - not usual that the genealogy of a prophet is carried back until his great-great-grandfather, but it does not suffice to prove that the name *Hezekiah* signifies the well-known king. Nor is the knowledge of conditions at court displayed in 1,8-9 of such a kind as to prove the theory.

For the *dating* the interpretation of some words as hinting at the the invasion of the *Scythians* (cf. p. 121 f.) has been of some importance. But the assumption is of no more value here than in the case of *Jeremiah*.<sup>3</sup>)

On the Latin hymn *dies irae, dies illa*, attributed to *Thomas of Celano*, see *Kulp*, *Monatschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst* 1933, pp. 256ff.

*Literature*: *Edelkoort*, cf. p. 150. *G. Gerleman*, *Zephanja* (1942). - On 3,3b, see *Elliger*, in the *Bertholetfestschrift* (1950), p. 173; *Das Alte Test. Deutsch.* vol. 25, ad. loc.; *M. Stenzel*, in *Vetus Testamentum* 1951, pp. 303ff.

<sup>1</sup>) *Hyatt*, *Journal of Eastern Studies* (1948), pp. 25ff. gives remarkable arguments for a date under *Jehoiakim*.

<sup>2</sup>) in the Norwegian translation III, p. 719.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Horst's Commentary*, *Gerleman*, *Zephanja* (1942), p. 126, and *Hyatt*, op. cit. p. 27.

## HAGGAI

*The Prophet.*

The prophet who has given his name to this book is *haggai*, in the LXX '*Aggaios*, Lat. *Aggæus*. In the OT this name is only used of the prophet, but it occurs also outside the OT<sup>1</sup>). *Mitchell* in his commentary has explained it as an abbreviation of *hagijjāh*, cf. *zakkaj* of *z<sup>e</sup>karjāh*. Most scholars assume that the word is to be derived from *hagg*, "festival" ("Sunday-child", *Noth*<sup>2</sup>).

We know nothing of his family, not even his father's name. 1,13 was at an early date interpreted in terms of docetism<sup>3</sup>). In modern form this idea is found in André, *Le prophète Aggée* (1898), who assumes that the book like *Malachi* is anonymous. But the name *Haggai* like *Obadiah* is, in contrast to *Malachi*, a common name.

Ecclesiastical tradition relates that the prophet was of *priestly* descent. This tradition perhaps also underlies the notes in LXX, Syr., and the Vulgate, attributing the authorship of some canonical Psalms to *Haggai* and *Zechariah*. This is supported by reference to his cultic interests and his knowledge of priestly technique (2,11 ff.). But *Jewish* tradition, which also gives him many honourable tasks together with his contemporary *Zechariah* and with *Malachi*<sup>4</sup>), does not regard him as a priest. 2,11 more probably shows that he is a *layman* (*Marti*), for the teaching from the priests would in this case be hollow pretence, if *Haggai* himself was a priest and therefore knew the answers beforehand.

Concerning his *age* also many hypotheses have been advanced. *Ewald* concluded from 2,3, that he himself had seen the first temple and accordingly was an old man at the time of his ministry. According to *Mitchell* this might explain that he did not work for a longer time. *Augustine* has a tradition that both *Haggai* and *Zechariah* had preached in the exile before the deliverance from *Babylon*<sup>5</sup>), while other Church Fathers say that he was born in *Babylon*, but was a young man when he came to *Jerusalem*. None of these traditions seem to be of any value.

The historical activity of the prophet is mentioned in the Aramaic source in *Ezra* 5,1; 6,14.

*Contents of the Book.*

The small book, 2 chapters, through and through speaks of the prophet in the 3rd person sing. It contains 4 dated speeches, all connected with the restoration of the temple in 520. The speeches were delivered on the *first*

<sup>1</sup>) *Noth*, *Personennamen*, nr. 454 and p. 222.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Jerome*, in *Praef. Paul.*: "Aggæus, festivus et laetus, qui seminavit in lacrymis, ut in gaudio meteret".

<sup>3</sup>) *Jerome*, *Comment. ad Agg.*, 1,13, cf. *Bleek*, *Einleitung*, p. 379.

<sup>4</sup>) *Talmud*, *Megillah* 3a tells that these prophets were authors of the Aramaic Targum of *Jonathan* (cf. vol. I, p. 71), who worked on their instruction, and that they accompanied *Daniel* in the situation of *Dan.* 10,7.

<sup>5</sup>) *Enarr.* in *Os.* 147.

day of the 6th month (1,1), on the 21st of the 7th month (2,1), the 24th of the 9th month (two speeches, 2,10ff. and 2,20ff.).

1,1-15 calls upon the governor *Zerubbabel* and the High Priest *Joshua* to begin work on the temple, and we are told that they obey the prophet. 2,1 ff. brings consolation to the old people who mourned when they compared the poor new temple with that of Solomon: The new temple will get more glory, because the coming Messianic age will bring the treasures of the heathen to Jerusalem. 2,10ff. starts in a priestly (*tōrah*<sup>1</sup>), proving that ritual uncleanness is more contagious than cleanness, and accordingly accuses "this people" of being unclean. *Rothstein*<sup>2</sup>) explained this as being a denunciation of the *Samaritans*, alluding to the events recorded in *Ezra* 4,1-5, by that book dated to 538, but in the prophetic book, in time nearer to the events, rightly combined with the year 520. - 2,15-19 promises the people that the bad economic conditions now that the temple has begun to be built will disappear. 2,20-23 are directed to *Zerubbabel*, describing him as the "signet", i.e. as the Messianic king (cf. the contrast in *Jer.* 22,24, to which the passage in *Haggai* certainly alludes).

It is important to note that *Haggai* partly works together with *Zechariah* the latter having begun his ministry in the 8th month of 520, a month before the two last oracles of *Haggai*. The *dates* and 2,15-19 etc. seem to connect the prophecy with the New Year festival and its fertility and royal rites.

#### *Authenticity and Integrity.*

The book is generally considered to be written in *prose*<sup>3</sup>) and tells about *Haggai*, giving his oracles in *oratio directa*. It is therefore possible that the book is the work of a disciple or a circle of disciples. But the possibility, that the prophet personally is the author, only giving his story in a strictly objective form, cannot be dismissed beforehand<sup>4</sup>). Nevertheless, the form of the 3rd person constitutes a difference from the I-narrative of *Zech.* 1-8 which must be considered of some importance.

The *text* seems to be a little in disorder in some places.

The *date* in 1,15 hangs in the air. It may be a little helpful to assume that the division into chapters is not quite good here, the following date in 2,1 having no announcement of the year of the events. 1,15b may therefore be combined with 2,1. But 1,15a is then left, and with it the problem. Further it is pointed out that 2,10-19 contain two oracles under the same date, but without any further connection. And 2,15-19 would, as *Rothstein* has shown, go better with 1,1-11. 2,19, cf. v. 18, points to the day of the founding of the

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 188f.

<sup>2</sup>) *Juden und Samaritaner* (1908).

<sup>3</sup>) *Engnell*, *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*, says that the words of the prophet "can and ought to be arranged metrically". - I have controlled this assertion by the text, and think he is right. - *Mitchell*, in his commentary (in the *Intern. Crit. Comm.*) was on the right track.

<sup>4</sup>) *Eissfeldt*. p. 478.



temple as starting-point for the new age of benediction, but the date of 2,10 is not the day of the laying of the foundations. If we therefore with *Rothstein* assume that 2,15-19 originally was at home after 1,15a all difficulties vanish. - 1,1-11 too seem to be in some disorder. There seems to be too much material here, 5-6 being parallel to 7 + 9-11. *Eissfeldt* here assumes addition of two collections, Haggai's own memoirs and a more loosely built collection of his words. Other critics try to help themselves out of their difficulties through assumption of glosses and through displacements. Perhaps we only have to reckon with stylistic clumsiness.

*Literature:* The usual commentaries. My paper, *Quelques remarques sur le mouvement messianique parmi les Juifs aux environs de l'an 520 avant Jésus-Christ*, in *Rev. de l'hist. et de la philosophie rel.* 1930, pp. 493 ff., originally in *Actes du V<sup>e</sup> Congrès international d'histoire des Religions à Lund 1929*. Cf. also *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie* 1931, p. 67. - *Engnell*, *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk* I.

## ZECHARIAH

### *The Prophet Zechariah.*

The prophet who has given his name to the last book but one of the Dodecaphetion is the contemporary of Haggai, mentioned Ezra 5,1 and 6,14, and Neh. 12,16. The name is very common in Israel, also borne by other prophets (2 Chron. 24,20; 26,5). The *Latin* form *Zacharias* is derived from the *Greek*. The Hebrew is *zēkarjā* or *zēkarjahū*.

In 1,1 the prophet is called "*Son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo*". Ezra. 5,1; 6,14; Neh. 12,16 omit the name of the father. The difference is generally accounted for by the fact that Hebrew *ben* may denote a son's son.

*Bertholdt*<sup>1)</sup> assumed that one of the authors of chs. 9 ff., who are not identical with the prophet speaking in 1-8, had written under the name of the man mentioned in Is. 8,2. This should account for the genealogy in Zech. 1,1. But this assumption is not necessary, nor is it necessary to assume that "the son of Berechiah" has been inserted, due to a copyist's reminiscence of Is. 8,2 (*Pfeiffer*).

Neh. 12,16 informs us that the prophet was of *priestly* descent, probably a cult prophet. His time is determined through the *dates* given in 1,1 (the number of the day has been lost, only the month (the 8th) is given, or the meaning is that the prophet's call to penitence was pronounced throughout the month; the year is 520); 1,7 (24/8th, 520); 7,1 (4/9th, 518).

Like Haggai he concentrates most of his preaching around the building of the *temple*, completed in 516. Chs. 7-8 answer to a question concerning the continuation of fast-days, remembering the destruction in 587.

<sup>1)</sup> Einl. IV (1814), pp. 1697 ff.

### Contents.

The 14 chapters of the book are naturally grouped in *two sections* 1–8 and 9–14. 1–8 contain the just mentioned exact *dates*.

After an introduction in 1,1–6, warning the people against the ways of their godless ancestors, follow in 1,7–6,8 the so called “night-visions”, trying to encourage the people. The apparently quiet situation of the world does not mean that the Day of Judgment is remote. In detail the visions describe the extension of the congregation, the authority of the priesthood is stressed (ch. 3), promises are given to Zerubbabel and Joshua (ch. 4), and to the people concerning the extermination of sin from the country (ch. 5), and the series is concluded by a description of the mission of messengers of Yahweh who are to create the great change of the world (ch. 6). – In 6,9–15 the prophet is commanded to crown Zerubbabel. The present text has been altered, the name of Zerubbabel having been obliterated and that of Joshua introduced instead. 7–8 asserts that the time of the Messiah will certainly come and that the heathen will be converted.

9–14 contain no information concerning authorship and no dates. The chapters are bound together with the book of Malachi by the superscriptions of 9,1, 12,1 and Mal. 1,1, describing the words by the term *massā*<sup>1</sup>. It is generally assumed that the three sections introduced in this way originally belonged together, but that Mal. was separated to complete the number of Twelve Prophets.

9–14 can be divided into *two parts* 9–11 + 13,7–9, and 12–14 ÷ 13,7–9:<sup>1</sup>)

They contain various prophecies, partly of a very obscure kind, e.g. the shepherd-oracles 11,4–17, and the oracle on “the pierced one” in 12,10–14. Some passages have been used in the NT, above all the description of the triumphal entry of the Messiah (9,9–10) and the 30 silver coins of the traitor (11,12–13). Especially 12–14 are in many parts of a strongly *apocalyptic* character.

### Authenticity.

Nobody will contest the authenticity of 1–8. At most the question may be raised, whether or not the visions are real visions or merely literary form as in later Apocalyptic. It is most probable that real visions are at the base of the chapters, but the schematic manner of reporting them proves that the primitive experiences have been strongly worked over by the prophet or his disciples.

Early uncertainty of tradition concerning 9–14 is testified in Mt. 27,9 ascribing 11,12–13 to *Jeremiah*.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. Ewald, *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes I* (1840), pp. 308ff.

In 1653 *Mede* rejected the OT tradition in favour of that of the NT. Critical examination here as elsewhere began in the 18th century. As 9,10, 13; 10,6ff. apparently presuppose the existence of the *Ephraemite* kingdom some were inclined to date 9-11 before 721. 12,11 was taken as an allusion to the death of *Josiah* in 609 and accordingly dated between this year and 587. These dates have however later been replaced by another, already supposed by *Hugo Grotius*<sup>1)</sup> and *Eichhorn*.

In ZATW 1881-82 *Stade* gave a detailed argument for a date in *Hellenistic* times. This has been the base of all later discussion of the problems, some scholars still maintaining some *pre-exilic* material in the chapters, esp. in 9-11 + 13,7-9. The main difficulty is to give a satisfactory explanation e.g. of the allusions to - contemporary(?) - elements given by the *shepherd-sections* of ch. 11. We have to reckon with the inclination of later Apocalyptic to an archaizing use of names as Assyria and Egypt as emblems of the world empires of later ages, e.g. Babel for Rome in Apoc. Joh., cf. Is. 19,23-25; 27,13 where Assyria and Egypt may be significations of the Syrian Seleucids and the Egyptian Ptolemies.<sup>2)</sup>

The *identity of the author* of all the sections is also disputed<sup>3)</sup>. So much is clear that the chapters to a great extent are composed of traditional material. They are considered greatly dependent upon other OT literature. In their form they resemble collections of material from different ages like Is. 10,5-12,6, compiled to give an apocalyptic picture of the Day of Yahweh.

9,13 *speaking of Javan* (the Greeks)<sup>4)</sup> as a world power makes it probable that the present collection cannot be earlier than the time of *Alexander the Great*. 13,2ff., announcing the end not only of false, but of all prophecy, brings us down to days when no reliable prophets were known, as testified in 1 Macc. 4,46 and 14,41. - 12,10 seems to presuppose ideas like those of Is. 53, but the exceedingly obscure sentences may also rest on ancient mythological cultic ideas. And many eschatological ideas remind of Ezekiel and Joel, e.g. 14,8, cf. Ez. 36,36,36; 39,29.

Upon the whole it is probable that "*Deutero-Zechariah*" consists of *one or two tradition complexes*, partly containing old material, composed by one or two apocalyptists from the Greek period. Whether we have to go down to the time of the Book of Daniel depends upon our courage to interpret the shepherd sections of ch. 11 as alluding to persons from that time. Certainty

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Buhl*, in Herzog's Realencyclopädie, s. v. Sacharja, p. 301.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 489, and *Pfeiffer*, pp. 610ff. - *Elliger*, ZATW 1949-50, p. 103ff., and *Delcor*, Vetus Test. 1951, pp. 110ff. find allusions to Alexander the Great, while *Malamat*, The Israel Expl. Journ. 1950-51 defends a date ca. 720 B.C.

<sup>3)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 492f. <sup>4)</sup> cf. above, p. 137f., concerning Joel.



has not been attained. And Zech. 9-14 is still a great field for work in order to bring more recent points of view into the understanding of the pre-history of their material.

### *Integrity.*

The text of the book is not in the best state. *Ewald* proved that 13,7-9 belongs to ch. 11 and by accident has been removed from its proper place. And also in 1-8 the text has suffered damage, cf. above concerning the alteration of the name of Zerubbabel in 6,9ff.: Here tendency has been at work. In ch. 4 too there seems to have happened something to the text, the end of v. 10 forming the legitimate sequel to the beginning of v. 6 and the verses between these passages being an independent oracle to Zerubbabel. A distinct pattern of arrangement seems to have been broken in most of the descriptions of the visions, and alien elements seem to have been introduced. Apparently an original narrative in the first person sing., furnished with precise dates, was supplemented by other material, also using the first person sing., but without dates, and by some sections which do not use the I-form, but are introduced by a "thus saith the Lord"<sup>1)</sup>. This would mean that we have three "strata" in 1-6. Further we have to count upon the usual glosses and textual errors.

*Literature:* Besides the commentaries cf. my article mentioned above to Haggai (p. 156) and my *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie* (1931), pp. 67ff. *Rothstein*, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja* (1910). *Möhlenbrink*, *ZDPV* 1931, pp. 257ff. *Galling*, *Zeitschr. für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft* 1931, pp. 193ff. *Sellin*, *JBL* 1931, pp. 242ff.; *Press*, *ZATW* 1936, pp. 43ff. *Hans Schmidt*, *ZATW* 1936, pp. 48ff. *Rowley*, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1947), p. 24. *The Missionary Message of the OT*, pp. 35, 70 and 71. *Rignell*, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja* (1950).

*Torrey*, *JBL* 1936, pp. 247ff. *Eissfeldt*, *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 1937, p. 163f. On 9-14, see *T. Jansma*, *Inquiry into the Text and the Ancient Versions of Zech. IX-XIV* (1949).

### MALACHI

#### *The Name of the Book.*

The last book of the Twelve Prophets is *anonymous*. Its Hebrew name *mal'ākī* may of course be shortened from a personal name *mal'ākijjāh*<sup>2)</sup>. But this name is not found elsewhere in the OT, and it seems very improbable that a man should have called his son so, at all events in post-exilic times, for this name could mean "The Angel of the Lord". Moreover, LXX at the decisive point of the text 1,1 reads *mal'ākō*, "his messenger", adding some words from Haggai 2,15,18, cf. Mal. 2,2-3. The *Targum* follows the Mas-

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Eissfeldt*, pp. 481ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *v. Bulmerincq*.

soretic text, but adds a note to the effect that "my messenger" is Ezra the Scribe, a tradition also testified by *Jerome*<sup>1</sup>). Probably the name originated from 3,1, where a "messenger" is mentioned, who later was identified with the prophet. It cannot be decided, if the word so early was understood as a personal name. This understanding of course underlies the Greek title of the book, from which the Latin name *Malachias* is derived.

In reality the superscription is parallel to Zech. 9,1 and 12,1 (cf. above). The truth in the separation of the last section is however that in these chapters we meet a person characteristically different from "Deutero-Zechariah".

Concerning the reading of 3,1, cf. *Johs. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semiten* (1914), p. 43 (Danish original 1912, p. 42). But an emendation of the text (*melek* for *mal'ak*) is not necessary, cf. my *Det sakrale kongedömmet*, p. 60.

### Contents.

In MT the book has 3 chapters, in LXX, the Vulgate and post-Reformation translations have 4, dividing ch. 3 in two parts, the last ch. beginning at 3,19. These chapters contain 6 *speeches*, all of them introduced by a sort of *dialogue*: Yahweh or the prophet first advances a thesis, challenged by the people or the priest, and defended in the rest of the speech by Yahweh in words of reproach and doom.<sup>2</sup>) It seems possible to read the speeches rhythmically.

1,2-5 maintains the love of Yahweh for Judah and his hate of *Edom* (cf. Rom. 9,13). 1,6-2,9 reproaches the *priests* for neglect of the *sacrificial* cult. 2,10-16 according to common opinion reproaches the Jews for contracting *mixed marriages*<sup>3</sup>). 2,17-3,5 asserts against the doubts of the people that Yahweh is the God of judgment and will restore the rights of the people, but first Yahweh's messenger (cf. above, probably the *Messiah*) must purge the priesthood and the temple. 3,6-12 enforces the duty of giving *tithes*. 3,13-21 promises the loyal Jews reward and the ungodly punishment on the Day of Judgment. The book concludes with an admonition (3,22-24) to keep the Law of Moses and by the announcement that the prophet *Elijah* will come before the judgment. This word is Mk. 1,1 combined with Is. 40,3 and so apparently made a word of Isaiah.

### Date.

Like Haggai and Zech. 1-8 the book is a witness to the changed outlook of prophecy in post-exilic times. The more marked interest in the *cult* shows that the prophet is a follower of Ezekiel. The temple being restored and the cult working, *terminus post quem* is 516 B.C. "The governor" of 1,8 is of course the Persian government representative. 2,17ff. mirrors the disappointment caused by the delay of the fulfilment of the Messianic hopes, and 3,6ff

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 612.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 198 ff.

<sup>3</sup>) *Hvidberg, Graad og Løfter i det gamle Testamente* (1938) thinks that a reproach for adoration of foreign gods is meant.

alludes to bad harvests and locust plagues, perhaps the cause of the disappointment. Accordingly the promises of Haggai seem to be earlier. This also carries us into the time after the restoration of the temple in 516. The prophet seems to be influenced by the *deuteronomistic* theories concerning the *priests*, but on the other hand he knows the regulations of the *tithes* found in P<sup>1</sup>). If Hvidberg's interpretation of 2,10-16<sup>2</sup>) should be right the usual argument from the mixed marriages for a date before Ezra cannot be used, and consequently *v. Bulmerincq's* assumption (cf. the Targum), that the "messenger" of 3,1 is Ezra, becomes still more uncertain<sup>3</sup>). But the rest of the argument is satisfactory to date the book to the time before *Nehemiah*, i.e. before 445. For a later date<sup>4</sup>) there are not criteria of sufficient strength.

### *Authenticity.*

The only point where the tradition concerning the authorship is challenged is the concluding words, 3,22-24. This is namely an interpretation of 3,1, saying that the "messenger" is Elijah. This is probably a later commentary.

*Literature:* A. von Bulmerincq's commentary in two volumes (1926-32).

## "THE PROPHETS" AS RELIGIOUS DOCUMENT

*Law and Gospel* have, as sketched above<sup>5</sup>), been preached in the Canon of the Pentateuch. To this corresponds also the second part of the Hebrew Canon, "The Prophets", in its two parts, in the book of Joshua originally connected with the most important, first part of the Holy Scripture. "*The prophetae priores*" are part of the Deuteronomistic Work of History. The main tendency of this work is to give the exiled Jewish people a warning retrospect of the history, through which Israel has been brought under the judgment of God. "*The prophetae posteriores*", then, have certainly been regarded, in post-exilic times, as expressions of the *hope* of the chosen people, the gospel of the Lord to his congregation, promising the erection of his kingdom. In this way the second part of the Canon joins itself organically to the first part. And it is the unfulfilled promises of the prophetic books which are studied by the later apocalyptists (Dan. 9). The books are read from two points of view, Warning against repeating the disobedience of the fathers and Hope of a renewal of the glory of Israel.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie, pp. 72-57.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. above, p. 161, n. 3.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. Eissfeldt, p. 596.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. literature by Hvidberg, loc. cit.; Pfeiffer, p. 614. Especially the Arabic invasion of Jerusalem cannot be dated so certainly as to be used for a closer dating.

<sup>5</sup>) p. 77.



## THE HAGIOGRAPHIA

The third part of the Hebrew Canon is called in Hebrew *kētūbim*, the "writings". It comprises 11 books, *The Psalms*, *The Proverbs*, and *Job*; further the so-called "Five Rolls", the *Five Megilloth*, arranged according to the five great festivals of the Jewish calendar, viz. *The Song of Solomon*, read at the Passover-festival, *Ruth*, at the Feast of Weeks, *The Lamentations*, on the 9th of Ab, the day of memory of the destructions of the Holy City in 587 B.C. and A.D. 70., *Ecclesiastes*, at the Feast of Booths, and *Esther*, belonging to the Festival of Purim. These books are counted as 5 writings, not, like the Dodecapheton, as one book. The collection is concluded by the apocalyptic *Book of Daniel* and the historical works, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, and the *Chronicles*. Some authorities however placed *Ruth* in connection with *Judges* and *Lamentations* with *Jeremiah* (cf. LXX), counting only 22 Holy Books in the Canon<sup>1</sup>).

The order of the books varies to some extent in the manuscripts<sup>2</sup>). The LXX reckons *Job* among the historical books and therefore places this book after *Chron.* and before the *Psalms*. In the *Syriac* version *Job* comes just after the *Pentateuch*, probably because a tradition reported that Moses wrote the book<sup>3</sup>). The LXX also places *Ruth* after *Judges* and *Lam.* after *Jeremiah*. The arrangement of the LXX has determined the order of the books in later translations.

For the order of the Hagiographia cf. *Haller-Galling*, *Die Fünf Megilloth* (in *Eissfeldt's Handbuch*) (1940), pp. VII–VIII, and *Rudolph's* commentary on *Lamentations* (1939, in the series of *Sellin*), p. 1.

### THE PSALMS

#### The Name of the Book and its Contents.

First among the "Writings" we nearly always find the *Book of Psalms*. Its importance also appears in the fact that it can represent the whole third part of the Canon (Lk. 24,44)<sup>4</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 26 and 32.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 32.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 26.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 26.

In Hebrew it is called *tehillim* or *tillim*, "songs of praise"<sup>1)</sup>. Transcriptions in *Origen*, *Hippolytus*, and *Jerome* also use the fuller form *sefer tehillim*<sup>2)</sup>. In Greek tradition the book is called *biblos psalmôn* (cf. Lk. 20,42; Act. 1,20), and in the LXX we find the name *psalmoi*. In the Codex Alexandrinus we have the superscription *psalterion*, originally "stringed instrument" (cf. Dan. 3,5), but also "a collection of songs". The liturgical use of the psalms in the Church – taken over from the Jewish temple and the synagogue<sup>3)</sup> – above all in the Mediaeval Church and in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, has given it a more direct influence upon the thoughts of the people than any other Biblical book.

A comedy scene in a work by the Danish 18th century poet *L. Holberg* gives in its grotesque humour a strong impression of this importance of the book to common people from ca. 1700: A peasant who has done military service tells in a language full of comic misunderstandings of foreign words how he lay reading the book the night before a battle.

The book contains 150 poems. They are differently divided in the texts, cf. the commentaries. Important is it that the LXX combines 9 and 10 and 114 and 115, but divides 116 and 147 in two poems. Therefore it is necessary to take care when reading authors, quoting the LXX or the Vulgate and dependent translations<sup>4)</sup>, for the numbering between 9 and 147 is there different from the Hebrew text. Some witnesses combine Ps. 1 and 2<sup>5)</sup>.

Accordingly we cannot always assume that the tradition concerning beginning and conclusion in the poems is quite reliable. It is clear that Ps. 42–43 are one poem. The extension of Ps. 118 is very disputed in tradition. Many divide Ps. 19 and others into two or more parts.

Ps. 9–10, 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, and 145 are *alphabetic*.<sup>6)</sup>

LXX has one psalm more than the Massoretic text, "outside the number".

Finally many LXX-manuscripts contain a series of "*odae*", added by the Greek Church, mostly poems from other parts of the Bible, regularly used in the service.

<sup>1)</sup> The word is usually femin. but the masculine form is used here, cf. *Gesenius-Kautzsch*, § 87 n.

<sup>2)</sup> *Steuernagel*, p. 724.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 625, with a note referring Ps. 74,8 to the synagogues which I consider to be wrong. The oldest reference to synagogue worship comes, as *Pfeiffer* notes, from an inscription from the environs of Alexandria, dating from the times of Ptolemy III (247–222).

<sup>4)</sup> e.g. when the Roman Missal quotes the Psalms!

<sup>5)</sup> Act. 13,33, according to some manuscripts, cf. my *Forelæsninger over Indledning til de gtl. Salmer* (1932), p. 27, cf. pp. 31 and 33.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. I, p. 122, and concerning a probable explanation of the early origin of this device, p. 176. – On the text of 9–10, see *G. R. Driver*, *Semitic Writing*, pp. 200ff.

Concerning the translations of *Jerome* of the Psalter, cf. the edition of *Rahlf's* in vol. X of the Göttingen edition of the Psalter, pp. 52ff.; *J. M. Harder*, *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi* (1922).

On the *forms of literature*, see vol. I. pp. 146ff.

### Prehistory of the Collection.

The 150 psalms are in the Massoretic text distributed in *five books*, separated by *doxologies*, 1-41; 42-72; 73-89; 90-106; 107-150. This is an artificial division, according to common opinion an imitation of the division of the Torah into five books of Moses.

But several instances indicate that the collection, as we have it now, has been formed on the basis of different *earlier collections*. 72,20, "The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended", indicates the existence of a collection called by this name, the verse evidently being the subscription of this collection. But in the present book we also find psalms "of David" after this verse. Presumably the traditional notes concerning *authors* refer to collections which circulated under the names of the different persons such as David, Asaph, Ethan, Heman, the Sons of Korah etc.<sup>1)</sup>

But not all of these notes can be combined with original collections. The name of *David* has attracted poems, so that at last the whole book bears his name, and it has therefore often been inserted into superscriptions, cf. the fact that the LXX contains more psalms of David than the Massoretic text, and that the school of Antioch attributed all the poems to him. A result of interpretation is also the name of *Solomon* over Ps. and 127, of *Moses* in 90, and the places in the LXX where *Haggai* and *Zechariah* are mentioned as authors.

To the origin of the collection from an addition of smaller collections testify also some of the *doublets*. Ps. 14 is identical with Ps. 53, the end of Ps. 40 with Ps. 70; Ps. 108 consists of Pss. 57 and 60. The *Ma'alôth Psalms* (120-134) certainly constitute an independent collection.

The first book (1-41) is nearly entirely "Davidic", only 1, 2, and 33 are anonymous (10 is no independent psalm). The second book mostly uses the divine name *Yahweh*, so that we may with certainty assume that the few places containing the name *Yahweh* as a rule are due to forgetfulness on the part of redactors or copyists. Accordingly an "Elohistic" collection must have existed some time. Perhaps this also applies to the third book. Still more smaller collections have been assumed<sup>2)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 166f.

<sup>2)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, pp. 500ff.



### The Date of the Book and its Subdivisions.

Ecclus. 47,8-10 shows that a collection of psalms under the name of David existed in the time of Sirach, ca. 200 B.C. But whether it is identical with our collection we do not know. 1 Macc. 7,17 (from ca. 100 B.C.) quotes Ps. 79,2-3, and 14,41 alludes to Ps. 110,4. This presumably presupposes that these passages are "words of scripture", quotations from a canonical collection. The same may be inferred from the Prologue to the Greek translation of the work of Sirach, written ca. 117 B.C., which speaks of translations of "the other books of our fathers" beside the Law and the Prophets, most probably alluding to a collection of Hagiographa. And as the Psalms nearly always have occupied the first place it is to be assumed that the translator of Ecclus. above all knows them as Holy Scripture.

In 1 Chron. 16 many think that we have a proof of the existence of the present book with its five parts at the time of the Chronicler, for v. 36 quotes the doxology concluding the fourth book. It is not possible to take Ps. 106,48 as part of the original text of the psalm. The manner in which the Chronicler here accumulates passages of psalms seems to indicate that he quotes Scripture. But we cannot set aside the possibility that the psalm has been interpolated in Chron., and accordingly the conclusion concerning the date of the collection of Psalms is not safe.

But so much seems evident that we *hardly may venture to go below the middle of the 2nd century B.C. in our dating of the present book*. This follows from the passages from 1 Macc. and the Prologue to Ecclus. For the position of the Psalms as Holy Scripture can hardly have been something quite novel in the time of these authors.

When the collection was founded it is more difficult to say. That it has been done mostly in the time after the exile follows from the existence of notoriously *post-exilic poems* in the collection (Ps. 137!). The historical misunderstandings of the psalms, which caused them to be regarded not as belonging to a cultic, but a historical context<sup>1)</sup>, speak in favour of a late date. But we must also reckon with the work of later hands.

### The Dating of the individual Poems.

*19th century* criticism, still making its effects felt in the treatment of the Psalms, combined the question of the date of the collection intimately with that of the individual poems. From the post-exilic character of the former it was inferred that the poems also were post-exilic and represented *Jewish*,

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 165 ff.

not ancient *Israelite* religion. The result of the investigations carried on since the beginning of the 20th century<sup>1</sup>) must however be that we have to leave behind us the a priori presupposition that the psalms are post-exilic. Psalmody was known in Israel from its earliest days. The oldest Israelite poem which we are able to date approximately, the Song of Deborah (Judg. 5) is a psalm<sup>2</sup>). And psalms were composed in the OT style in other parts of the Near East before we know anything of Israel<sup>3</sup>).

But also other criteria for dating have been advanced without success. This applies to the evolutionistic theory of Gunkel<sup>4</sup>) as well as to the attempt

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 113 ff. My Indledning til de gtl. Salmer, pp. 45 ff. Mowinkel, Psalmenstudien I, p. 161, and II, pp. 191–202. – Gressmann, in *The Psalmists*, ed. by D. C. Simpson (1926), p. 15, while admitting the principle, nevertheless clings to the old opinion that most psalms are post-exilic. The same was the case with the founder of the new approach to the psalms, Gunkel, who only reluctantly gave way to the arguments of Mowinkel. The uncertainty of dating the poems is well illustrated by T. H. Robinson in his fine book *Poetry and Poets of the Old Testament* (1947), pp. 120 ff., cf also the words of D. C. Simpson in the introduction to the collection of essays mentioned above, p. XI: "Thus critics, from the earliest days of criticism, in so far as they have sought to determine the age of any given psalm by supposedly historical allusions in it, have lamentably failed; and in so far as they have ignored the literary criterion, have done less than justice to the language of the Psalter". In Oesterley's *A Fresh Approach to the Psalms* (1937) we find a cautious tendency to underline the strong possibility of finding pre-exilic poems in the collection. Especially he rightly stresses the testimony of the poems of Deutero-Isaiah (p. 42 f.).

<sup>2</sup>) Engnell says (*Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* (1943), p. 176, n. 2), "Speaking candidly, there is merely one psalm in the whole Psalter of which I am quite convinced that it is post-exilic: No. 137. And as far as I can ascertain, no other psalm is comparable with it in contents and style. Should this be a mere coincidence?" I agree completely with Engnell in his words concerning the singular character of the psalm, both materially and stylistically. But I think that there are still criteria for dating also other poems to the post-exilic times. I refer e.g. to the criteria given in the history of the priesthood, cf. my *Studier over det zadokidiske præsteskabs historie*, p. 80 ff. compared with my commentary on the Psalms, pp. 591 f. and 648 f., concerning the dating of Pss. 118 and 135.

<sup>3</sup>) *Babylonian* and *Egyptian* parallels are abundantly given in many works, e.g. also in the book of Oesterley, mentioned in the previous note. Canaanite parallels from *Ras Shamra* are found in the works mentioned in the notes to vol. I, pp. 113–118 and 146–159. I must add two works, which I received after the finishing of the manuscript of vol. I, namely Coppens, *Les Parallèles du Psautier avec les Textes de Ras-Shamra-Ougarit* (in *Bulletijn voor Geschiedenis en Exegese van het Oude Testament*, 1946, Deel 18, pp. 113 ff.). and Patton, *Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms* (1944), cf. also Albright, in the *Bertholet-Festschrift* (1950) and the *Studies... presented to T. H. Robinson* (1950); *A Catalogue of Early Hebr. Lyric Poems* (Ps. LXVIII) (*Hebr. Union Coll. Annual* 1950–51, pp. 11), cf. the *Appendix*.

<sup>4</sup>) *The Poetry of the Psalms, in Old Testament Essays 1927* (Papers read before the Society for Old Testament Study), pp. 129 ff.



of Hempel<sup>1)</sup> to describe an increasing tension between form and contents, viz. the contrast between the ancient words and phrases and the higher religious development attained by Israel by and by. The results are too vague to be of greater significance<sup>2)</sup>. Of some importance is the *historical* criterion used by Mowinckel, that *social developments* from later periods of the monarchy, with the dissolution of the old tribal culture and the sharpening of class strife, have influenced the view of the *enemies* described in the poems<sup>3)</sup>. Psalms mentioning the *king* have of course been composed during the period of the monarchy. On the other hand, the occurrence of *Aramaisms* do not with certainty lead to a late date. They *may* – as in Ps. 2, 12, a royal psalm, i. e. a preexilic one, – be due to textual corruption. But we know that “educated classes” in Jerusalem understood Aramaic before the exile (2 Ki. 18, 26)<sup>4)</sup>.

This means that the most certain criteria are still found in the ancient *philological method*, seeking allusions to historical events or conditions in the poems. We must make it clear to ourselves, however, that we cannot go so far and so assuredly on this way as the last generation did, because the poems generally allude, not to historical, but to cultic situations and ideas; and we have to be on our guard against the “method of association of ideas”, used with too great confidence in older phases of the history of criticism<sup>5)</sup>. As a rule we must keep in mind that the psalms may date from *all periods* in the history of Israel and Judaism, but that *the classical period of this poetry is the ancient times*, when the poems were expressions of the relations of men and God. Later days go on using the old forms, and the moods of these times may be felt in some cases. The words have, in different ages, been capable of expressing the sentiments of men. That is the greatness of this poetry. A certain *re-interpretation* must have taken place in different periods, just as we have to do when they are sung at morning or evening prayer in a Chri-

1) Althebr. Lit., pp. 37–44. 2) cf. my Indledning til de gtl. Salmer, pp. 47ff.

3) Psalmenstudien I, p. 117f., cf. my Indledning til de gtl. Salmer, pp. 113ff.

4) Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien VI, p. 3; cf. further Bauer und Leander, Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache I, § 2. G. R. Driver (by letter) says: The language of Hebrew poems is largely Aramaic, i. e. Hebrew poets employed old words from early “Gemeinsemitisch” which still survived in Aram., but had died out in daily Hebrew.

5) This is still done in the case of Ps. 42–43 by Robinson, in Poetry and Poets, p. 121. In my commentary I have stated my reasons for assuming – with Mowinckel – that the verses are the usual description of the distressed psalmist in the waters of the underworld – as e. g. in the Psalm of Jonah.



stian church or chapel.<sup>1)</sup> The most important "re-interpretation" is the "democratization" of psalms originally belonging to the royal ritual<sup>2)</sup>.

### The Authors.

To the remarks on the poets of the Psalter in vol. I, p. 166f., we only have to add a few observations.<sup>2a)</sup> The tradition is late and unreliable. The divergences between the Massoretic text and the LXX indicate that the different circles of collectors were of different opinions. Both the names of authors and determination of situations are often results of interpreters' combinations, not expressions of old tradition. The Syriac translation contains superscriptions, based on a different theory.

### The technical Terms.

The many, mostly unintelligible terms found in the superscriptions, have found various explanations. Some have been thought to be indications of literary types, e.g. *mizmor*, *šir*, *ṭḥillah*, *ṭḥillah*; musical instructions, e.g. *binneḡimot*; indications of melody, liturgical instructions<sup>3)</sup>. Mowinckel<sup>4)</sup> has made attempts to solve the riddles by assuming that most of the words are indications concerning the liturgical, cultic use of the psalms, signifying the place in life of the poem or alluding to the manner of execution of the singing, e.g. that the well-known *Selah* notes points in the ritual, when the congregation had to utter some fixed cultic exclamation. This at least is methodically sound when we assume that the psalms are essentially old cultic poetry. But Mowinckel has himself stressed the highly hypothetical character of his attempts.<sup>5)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> cf. also the words of C. J. Bleeker in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1948, col. 57: "Israel has used certain pre-Israelite mythological and ritual patterns, has also coined these after its own spirit. To interpret Biblical documents means to do justice to the pre-Israelitic background, but also to the coining."

<sup>2)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 147, 155f. – <sup>2a)</sup> cf. Mowinckel, *Offersang og Sangoffer* (1951), ch. XVI.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. Pfeiffer, pp. 642ff.

<sup>4)</sup> *Psalmestudien* IV. – *Offersang og Sangoffer*, ch. XXV.

<sup>5)</sup> Concerning the expression *ṭḥāwīd*, cf. vol. I, p. 167. On *lammēnasseh* I refer to the rendering of the younger translations (Aq., Symm., Theod., Jerome), "for the victor", in favour of the theory of the Psalms originally belonging to the royal ritual, cf. vol. I, p. 147f. The expression might then mean the same as *ṭḥāwīd*. On *Selah*, see Snaith, in *Vetus Testamentum* 1952, pp. 43ff.

## Song-Book of the Temple – Book of Edification.

The psalms were originally *ritual poems*<sup>1)</sup>. This leads to the conclusion that the collection as a whole was established to serve similar ends.

But it must be noted that the collection contains poems which seem to belong to other spheres of life. Ps. 1, 112, and 127 seem to be of a *didactic*, non-cultic kind<sup>2)</sup>. This makes us assume that other motives have been at work in the composition of the collection<sup>3)</sup>. From later times we possess not only the information of tradition concerning the use of the psalms at festivals and Sabbaths and week-days, but e.g. the NT evidently shows us a theological and edificatory use of the Psalms. *The present book was not created only as the song-book of the second temple*. This is only one of the aims at which the collectors have looked. It has been created in order to have an *authoritative expression of Israel's religion*, just as the laws and prophecies and wisdom were collected with this aim in view. The two introductory psalms, 1 and 2, show the tendency, the admonition of the collectors to the readers. They are invited to choose the right path to the Messianic glory, the study of the Law and the obedience towards the word of God. The Book of Psalms is not only a ritual song book, but also, and perhaps more, a "*Wisdom Book*", a book showing the way of a righteous life<sup>4)</sup>.

*Literature* (cf. vol. I). Commentaries in the series. Buhl (2nd ed. 1918). My commentary (1939). Weiser I-II (1950). Oesterley (1939). Important liturgical material in the commentary of Calès (1936 – Roman Cath.). – The Roman Catholic commentaries mentioned by J. H. Cobb in *The Study of the Bible...* ed. Willoughby, p. 123 (P. Boylan (1926–31), Th. E. Bird (1926–27)), I do not know. O. R. Sellers, in the same work, ed. by Willoughby, gives a brief survey, *The Status and Prospects of Research concerning the Psalms* (pp. 129–134). More detailed and up to date is A. R. Johnson's essay in *The OT and Modern Study*, ed. Rowley (1951), pp. 162ff. – Allgeier, *Die Altlateinischen Psalterien* (1928) on the textual history of the versions of Jerome. C. Lattey, *The First Book of Psalms* (Pss. I–XLI) (1939). *The Psalter in the Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures* (1944). – A. Bea, *Le Nouveau Psautier Latin* (1947). – cf. *Appendix* to vol. I, p. 117, l. 6.

<sup>1)</sup> vol. I, pp. 165ff.

<sup>2)</sup> Mowinkel, *Psalmstudien* VI, p. 36.

<sup>3)</sup> The following opinions were given in my *Indledning til de gtl. Salmer*, (1932), pp. 27ff., in adhesion to Quell, *Das kultische Problem der Psalmen* (1926). Similar considerations are found in Pfeiffer's *Introduction*, p. 169f.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 254; cf. Mowinkel, *Offersang...* ch. XXIII.

## THE PROVERBS

### Name and Contents of the Book.

In Hebrew the book is called *mišlê*, abbreviated from *mišlê š'elōmōh* (1,1). In the LXX this is rendered *paroimiai Salomontos* or only *paroimiai*, in Latin *Liber proverbiorum* or *Proverbia*.<sup>1)</sup>

The title of the book, the first six verses<sup>2)</sup>, names *Solomon* as author. But other superscriptions in the book make clear that it is "a collection of collections" (*Pfeiffer*). In 10,1 we find a title marking another collection ascribed to *Solomon*. From the text of the LXX to 22,17 we may infer that 22,17 contains a new superscription, *dibrê ḥākāmim*, "Words of the Wise". This title is referred to in 24,23, where the small section 24,23-34 is added to the previous collections (22,17-24,22). 25,1 brings a new, important superscription, the *gam'elleh* as in 24,23 referring to the previous section, ascribing the following proverbs to *Solomon*, but naming as collectors "the men of *Hezekiah* king of Judah". This collection comprises 25-29. Then follow a series of "Words of *Agur*" (ch. 30) and a collection attributed to *the mother of king Lemuel* (31,1-9)<sup>3)</sup>. The book ends with an alphabetical poem on the "virtuous woman", perhaps added to the words of *Lemuel's* mother as a contrast to her warning (v. 3) against bad women.

The LXX brings 25,1-29,27 between 31,1-9 and the alphabetical poem, making *Solomon* the author of the poem. Further the LXX has 24,23-34 between 30,1-14 and 30,15-33.

If we assume that 1,1 is superscription to the whole book we must regard chs. 1-9 as *anonymous*. The extension of 1,1 (2-6) might apply to the whole book. We do not know if 1,1-6 has displaced an original title of the first collection (chs. 1-9).

### Composition and Authenticity.

The book accordingly is composed of 6 *minor collections*. An assumption of its origin through *addition of minor collections* is also supported by the divergent order of the collections in the Greek tradition. But there are indications that the minor collections have in their turn been compiled by joining together

<sup>1)</sup> Other titles are mentioned by Church Fathers, see *Wildeboer's* commentary, p. IX. Concerning the meaning of Hebrew *māšāl*, cf. vol. I, pp. 167ff. On its place in the Canon, vol. I, p. 32, and on the discussions concerning its canonicity, vol. I, p. 29, cf. *Wildeboer*, p. X.

<sup>2)</sup> *Pfeiffer*, p. 645.

<sup>3)</sup> A rendering of *Agur* and *Lemuel* not as proper names, but as verbal forms, is advocated by *Torczyner*, *The Proverbs of Solomon* (Tel-Aviv 1947 - in Hebrew), reviewed by *Danby* in the Book List of the Society for OT Study 1948, p. 29.



other, smaller complexes. Especially in 10-22,16 we have some *doublets*: 10,1 cf. 15,20; 10,2b, cf. 11,4b; 10,6b, cf. 10,11b; 10,8b, cf. 11,10b; 10,13b, cf. 19,29b. But we are not able to separate the minor complexes which are thought indicated by the doublets, and this perhaps means that the repetitions are due to other causes, e.g. that they are primarily inherent in the material, collectors having heaped sentences without taking heed of the fact that some of them repeated the same phrases.

22,17ff. rests upon an *Egyptian* Wisdom book, the so-called Wisdom Book of *Amenemope*.

The title "The Proverbs of *Solomon*" does not, upon the whole, fit the entire book. 22,17-24,34 and the smaller sections in chs. 30-31 are not attributed Solomon. 25,1-29,27 are attributed to Solomon, but we are told that they have been collected by the men of *Hezekiah*. And further, the aforementioned indications of compilatory work make it probable that we have before us a compilation of material, which does not lead us farther back than to the compilers. 1 Ki. 5,9-14; 10,1-10; 13,23-24 testifies that wisdom literature was cultivated at the court of Solomon<sup>1</sup>). But it is quite impossible to assert the authenticity of any of the "Solomonic" books (Prov., Eccles., The Song of Sol., and Wisdom). We are here in the same case as concerning the relations of Moses to the Law and David to the Psalter. - Of the other names of authors, *Agur* and the mother of *Lemuel*, we know nothing at all. They seem to be non-Israelites. This is of some importance for the understanding of Wisdom literature as an *international* phenomenon, known in the entire ancient Orient, a fact also underlined through the character of 22,17-24,22 (cf. above).

### The Date.

The present book cannot be later than the 3rd century B.C. For *Sirach*, writing about 200 B.C., seems to quote 1,6, cf. Eccles. 47,17. Taken de rigueur this argument only applies to chs. 1-9. But there are indications seeming to prove that this part of the book is the latest part of Prov. This is accounted for by reference to the *form* of these chapters. Here the form of the sentence is beginning to develop into greater sections<sup>2</sup>). In 7,16 the word *etūn* is believed to be the Greek *othone*, which would suggest a date for the whole complex to the period after Alexander. But this is not certain, such Greek words may have spread with tradesmen to the East earlier than the Macedonian conquest.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 168 ff.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 176, cf. p. 255. - Prov. 2 is one long sentence.

The second collection (10-22,16) in contrast to 1-9 does not contain long speeches, but gives us the simplest form of the sentence, sometimes arranged apparently according to contents or catchword principle<sup>1</sup>). Single *Aramaisms*<sup>2</sup>) are no certain argument for a dating to the post-exilic period of this collection or its individual members<sup>3</sup>).

The third section, 22,17ff., has been mentioned above as being a manifest adaptation of an Egyptian book. This work belongs to pre-exilic times (the period between 1000 and 600 B.C.), and accordingly this date may possibly also apply to the Israelite adaptation. This also may be the case with 25-29, if we, relying upon the age of Egyptian and other non-Israelite wisdom literature, accept the tradition of 25,1 that it has been compiled by "the men of *Hezekiah*". The period ca. 700 upon the whole seems to have been a time when *oral tradition* has been fixed in writing, in Israel perhaps because the catastrophe of Samaria in 721 showed the Jews that their traditions were in danger of being destroyed<sup>4</sup>). But this interest in collecting literature is from nearly the same age testified in the great monument to the literary interests of king *Assurbanipal*, the great library of Nineveh<sup>5</sup>).

For 30-31 no dates can be given.

What has been said here underlines that - as in the case of Psalm literature - we must not use wisdom literature exclusively as an expression of post-exilic culture. We here meet a type of literature which from early days is found in the Orient, and which has lived on through centuries down into very late ages. But we cannot here use the mention of *kings* as criterion of pre-exilic date (as in the case of the Psalms). For wisdom literature has always spoken of kings. This is here international material. In post-exilic days however, the Jews had no occasion to create royal psalms.

*Literature*, cf. vol. I. Commentaries: Oesterley (1929). Gemser (in Eissfeldt's Handbuch 1937).

Kuhn, Beiträge zur Erklärung des Salomonischen Spruchbuches (1931). Gerleman, The Septuagint Proverbs as a Hellenistic Document (Oudtestamentische Studiën VIII). Baumgartner, The OT and Modern Study, pp. 212ff.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 176.

<sup>2</sup>) Eissfeldt, p. 524.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. above, p. 168.

<sup>4</sup>) This idea was suggested by H. S. Nyberg in lectures held in Copenhagen University in the spring of 1948. - cf. also the catastrophe of *Hamath* at the same time, see vol. I, p. 104 f.

<sup>5</sup>) In Light from the Ancient Past (1947), p. 181, Finegan rightly points out the paradox of cruelty and culture embodied in this monarch. The paradox is however not seldom in history, down to our days. Where intellect is stronger than character such "paradoxes" will often appear.

## JOB

## Name and Contents.

*Job* is the Latinized form of the Greek *Ἰὼβ*, a transliteration of Hebrew *יִיבֹב*. The form *Hiob*, created by *Luther*, is explained through the *Latin* rendering of *aleph*<sup>1</sup>).

The place of the book in the Canon varies<sup>2</sup>). The *LXX* and our Bibles place it after the historical books. In the *Syriac* versions it comes after the Pentateuch, owing to the tradition that Moses was the author<sup>3</sup>). – Concerning the person of Job Jewish tradition upon the whole represents different opinions, related *Baba bathra* 14b–15a. Ez. 14,14,20 knows him, like Daniel and Noah, as a just man of the past<sup>3a</sup>). From the theory of *Mosaic authorship* it was inferred that Job lived in the age of Moses. But also other dates are given, ranging from the time of the Patriarchs to the exile and the age of Xerxes. Interesting is the discussion of the possibility of its being pure fiction, *poetry* like the parable of Nathan, 2 Sam. 12. But against this it was argued that the book mentions both the name of Job and his birthplace.

The author is as usual *anonymous*. The book is named after its main character.

It contains the well-known story of *Job*, introduced by the scenes describing the betting between God and Satan (the model of the “Prolog im Himmel” of Goethe’s “Faust”) and the ensuing trials to which Job is submitted, and which he sustains as the pious, god-fearing man, until he is forced by his pains to curse the day of his birth. This challenge is met by his friends *Eliphaz*, *Bildad*, and *Zophar*, and so begins the great *dialogue*, with its three “rounds”, 4–14, 15–21, 22–28. *Zophar* does not speak in the last of them. The friends maintain against Job the usual *theory of retribution*, that his misfortune must be a punishment for sin, and that he will be delivered, when he confesses it (cf. Ps. 32). Job repels the accusation, and through his temptations, which all the time bring him to the verge of blasphemy, he fights his way through to belief in God (ch. 19), although he does not understand and cannot see God’s justice. A climax is reached in the very difficult, and badly damaged text, of 19,23 ff., where he expresses the assurance that even if he dies, his “redeemer” (*go’el*, the signification of the “revenger”) will stand forth and maintain his justice. According to *Hölscher’s* interpretation (19,26, cf. 16,18–19) this means that Job in the realm of death will know of God’s vindication of his rights<sup>4</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. the commentary of *Hölscher*, p. 1. – The name is also known from the *El-Amarna* letters in the form *A-ia-ab* (cf. Arab. *ʿAīnūb*) as the name of a king of *Pi-hi-lim* (Pella, modern *Fahil*). Egyptian evidence from ca. 2000 has been adduced by *Albright*.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. p. 163.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 26 and 32. <sup>3a</sup>) cf. *Noth*, in *Vetus Testamentum* 1951, pp. 251 ff.

<sup>4</sup>) This does not, according to *Hölscher*, mean that Job has the hope of *resurrection*, as assumed by ecclesiastical interpreters since *Jerome*, but is founded upon the idea of conscious life of the dead in Hades, as known from Antiquity; cf. *Lindblom* in *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift* 1947, (S. 358), against *J. J. Stamm*, *Das Leiden des Unschuldigen i Babylonien und Israel* (1946).



The discussion is concluded by a *monologue* of Job (29–31) describing his former happiness, his present misfortune, and ending in a solemn oath of purification, presenting his life to the judgement of God. Then follow in 32–37 the *speeches of Elihu*, stressing man's sinfulness and recapitulating the point of view advocated by the three friends. Over against the challenge of Job the *speeches of Yahweh* (38–41) maintain that Job as creature cannot attack the Creator. This is admitted by Job in his answers (40,4–5 and 42,1–6): He has now met God face to face which has given him a knowledge of God which he had not got before, and this has renewed his faith in spite of all his sufferings. The book ends with the narrative of the rehabilitation of Job. The friends are rebuked, they have not spoken rightly of God, and Job gets all his happiness again doubled.

### Integrity.

From the review of the contents it can be seen that the book contains two distinctly different elements. There is a *narrative* (1–2 and 42,7–17) which provides the framework of the *dialogue* between Job and different persons, culminating in the speeches of God to Job.

The narrative is in *prose*, while the *dialogue* has poetical form. As to the problems of the literary form of the book the reader is referred to vol. I<sup>1)</sup>. The dialogue cannot have had any independent existence. In 8,4 and 29,5 it presupposes the description of Job's illness as given in the narrative. It is also significant, that in the narrative the *words* of the *dramatis personae* are given in rhythmic form. We know that Job was a figure of Israelite *tradition*. Ez. 14,14,20 mention Noah, Daniel, and Job as great examples of just men of the past. This has given rise to the very widespread theory of a "*Volksbuch*" taken over by the poet as framework to the dialogue. Against this some arguments have been advanced by Hölscher<sup>2)</sup>. The postulated differences between the narrative and the dialogue are not strong enough to account for a separation. In the dialogue Job is also the pious man who maintains his justice and turns to the justice of God and his compassion for help. That he sometimes gets impatient does not contradict his patience in the introductory chapters, but is psychologically well motivated as description of his temptations. When he sometimes seems to go too far in this respect it is caused by the arrogance of the friends.<sup>3)</sup> Just as little relevance can be attached to a presumed difference in the use of divine names. When Job and his friends in their speeches only seldom use the name of Yahweh it means that they are described as non-Israelite people and perhaps conceived as

<sup>1)</sup> pp. 181 ff. and 255 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. also Steuermannel, p. 694 f. A full record of the ideas concerning these questions is given by Pfeiffer, pp. 667 ff.; cf. also Engnell, Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk. I.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. my remarks on Ps. 74, in my commentary, p. 433.

living in pre-Mosaic days<sup>1</sup>). This is in harmony with the theory of P (Ex. 6) concerning the divine name<sup>2</sup>). In 1,21 "Yahweh" is used owing to inconsistency<sup>3</sup>). The author here probably uses a current benediction-formula. – The truth in the theory of the "Volksbuch" is probably that the poet himself freely tells an older *legend of Job*, and in this frame he then introduces his original contribution, the discussion with the friends<sup>4</sup>).

But nevertheless the full integrity of the book cannot be maintained. Especially the end of the book shows distinct signs of this. The speeches of Yahweh and the answer of Job are given in more than one form. There is a *first speech of God* in 38,1–39,30, briefly recapitulated in 40,4–5 followed by an answer of Job (40, 4–5), repeated in varied form (42,1–6) after the *second speech of Yahweh* (40,6–41,26)<sup>5</sup>). This is a hint that the speeches of Yahweh perhaps have been expanded by later additions, and consequently the answer of Job has been given in two different places. Or perhaps these parts of the book contain variants of the text, added to one another.

Another section, which is generally considered an addition, is 32–37, the speeches of *Elihu*. This person is introduced quite suddenly, not like the friends through the narrative of the framework, and he disappears without leaving any traces. The concluding part of the book only mentions the friends (42,7,9). His speeches anticipate the speeches of God and so deprives them of their true effect. They presuppose the whole preceding discussion and often turn both to Job and the friends, a method not used by the poet in the previous parts of the dialogue, where the speakers do not refer to the words of their opponents or their allies. *Hölscher* also thinks that the Elihu-speeches are of an inferior literary character. They were declared secondary by *Eichhorn* in 1780. To-day they are considered genuine e.g. by *Budde* and *Johs. Pedersen*<sup>6</sup>). The latter however only assumes that they are a draft by the author of the book, and ironical *parody* on the speeches of the friends. If this were right, it also may give a hint to understand the doublets of 38f., which perhaps also represent different sketches by the same poet.

Ch. 28, the beautiful poem on Wisdom, inaccessible for men, but in God's

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Steuernagel*, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. also the frequent use of *šaddai* in Job.

<sup>3</sup>) 12,9 the text is perhaps corrupt.

<sup>4</sup>) *Hölscher*, p. 5, refers to a similar combination of prose narrative and poetry in some Egyptian wisdom books.

<sup>5</sup>) Against *Dillmann's* attempt to understand the repetition as original see *Eissfeldt*, p. 509, and *Pfeiffer*, p. 675.

<sup>6</sup>) *Israel I–II*, p. 417, note to p. 291. *Budde's* opinion has been given in great detail in the 2nd ed. of his commentary (in *Nowack's* series from 1913), pp. XXIV–XXIX.

possession, is generally considered an interpolation. In the mouth of Job, in its present place, it seems to spoil the book, because the whole conclusion of the work is anticipated. Job would then already here have reached the insight which he does not attain until after the speeches of God. *Budde* tried to understand the chapter as part of the accusations of Job against God (v. 28): God knows everything, all wisdom, but he has only revealed a quite unsatisfactory part of it to men. – But this is not clearly expressed in the verse<sup>1</sup>). As a speech by one of the friends it cannot be understood, Zophar's speech being ended in 27,23, and the whole poem being at variance with the thought of the friends on wisdom (11,6; 15,8; 26,3). They presume that wisdom is in their possession, which is derided by Job (12,2; 13,5)<sup>2</sup>).

Perhaps there are also other places where the text is out of order. Especially the *last part of the dialogue* (25–27) is not clear. Bildad speaks very briefly, and Zophar is quite dumb, while Job after his speech in 26 makes another in 27. Of course we cannot deny the possibility that the poet in this way illustrates the defeat of the friends. But these questions are so detailed that we must refer the readers to the commentaries<sup>3</sup>).

### Tendency.

The book belongs to *Wisdom Literature*<sup>4</sup>), but has not the usual sentential form. The form of the dialogue is vivified through the different characters of the men who discuss the problem of retribution and God's justice. The friends who represent the traditional view that suffering is punishment for sin, and that Job could save himself by an open confession of his secret sin, reveal their characters in their way of speaking. *Eliphaz*, the older of them, speaks cautiously, respectful of Job's feelings, *Zophar*, the youngest, directly and without reserve, while Bildad seems to take the middle road<sup>5</sup>). Against them stands *Job* who has borne his sufferings patiently, but who now and then, pained and irritated by the lack of understanding exhibited by the friends, is carried off into outbursts, which must, to the readers who know the bet between

<sup>1</sup>) *Steuernagel*, p. 698, cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 672.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Hölscher. Engnell* (Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk) does not consider the argument decisive.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. also the review of the history of interpretation of the book in *Eissfeldt*, pp. 506–17, and the discussions of *Pfeiffer*.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 181 ff. – On the Babylonian poem *ludlul bel nemeqi*, see also *Th. Jacobsen*, in *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man* (by *Frankfort, Wilson, Jacobsen, and Irwin* (1948), pp. 212 ff).

<sup>5</sup>) *Eissfeldt*, p. 518.



God and Satan, seem to inaugurate the victory of the latter. But simultaneously Job more and more speaks to God, not to the friends, giving expression to both his rebellion<sup>1)</sup> against and his longing for God, his only true friend. Both needs are met by the revelation to Job in the speeches of Yahweh, showing him his own limitations, but also giving him an experience of God, affirming his longings and acknowledging his justice.

Thus the book does not give a theoretical solution of the problem of retribution, but on the basis of the experience of the poet it points out that the solution is to be found in the practical religious position, in which everything, doubts and defiance and desperate longing, may be freely expressed in words, and in which the meeting with the Almighty assures man of God's trustiness, an assurance being "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen". The book thus proclaims the decisive signification of *faith* for the understanding of man and God. The solution is very similar to that given by Ps. 73. *Eissfeldt* rightly underlines that a deep and strong experience of God is the ultimate source of the poet and also of his poetical strength.

#### The Poet and his Time.

As mentioned above tradition has no uniform answer to the question of the date of Job's lifetime, and it has been discussed, whether the book contains real history or not. That we have to do with a work of fiction is now generally acknowledged. The real Job is the anonymous poet, describing his temptations and experiences of God in the complaints of Job and the vain words of consolation of the friends, but also in the words of God which have been words of God to himself.

The poet has placed his poem in the country East or South-East of Palestine. This is proved by the names *Uz* (1,1), *Teman*, *Shuach*, and *Naama* (2,11)<sup>2)</sup>. Many modern commentators assume that the poet himself came from these parts, and that the poem has its roots among the *Edomites*<sup>3)</sup>. This people was celebrated for its wisdom<sup>4)</sup>. But perhaps this theatre of the drama is only determined by the traditional material, related and used by the poet. The poet obviously has described his hero as a man belonging to the *Patriarchal age*. The poems on the hippopotamus and the crocodile (40,15-41,26) have been adduced as arguments for *Egypt* as the native country of the poet,

<sup>1)</sup> cf. the accusations of Jeremiah – in psalm-style! – and psalms as 44, 74, 79.

<sup>2)</sup> Concerning these names cf. the commentaries.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 680.

<sup>4)</sup> Ob. 8, cf. vol. I, p. 169.

The problem of the genuineness of these poems set aside it must be said that the international character of wisdom literature makes the use of such themes outside of Egypt possible.

The date of the book is difficult to determine. The problem of retribution is a burning question already to *Jeremiah* and is made still more acute through the dogma of *Ez. 18*. This gives us a vague *terminus a quo*, the corresponding *terminus ad quem* being *Ecclus. 49,9*, talking of "the prophet Job who maintained all the ways of righteousness". 12,14-25 and 15,19 do not carry us farther. That these passages presuppose the deportations of Israel is not certain. 31,26 refers to cult of the stars, common in the 7th century, but it does not bring us nearer to a fixed date.

*Commentaries:* Dillmann (1891, 4th. ed.). Budde (1913, 2nd ed.). Driver-Gray (1921). Dhorme (1926), Rom.-Cath., very detailed). Hölscher (1952). Ca. 1920 Buhl wrote a commentary for the series of *Sellin*, which was never printed. The manuscript is preserved in the Royal Library at Copenhagen.

Mowinkel, Diktet om Ijob og hans tre venner (1924). Johs. Pedersen, Israel I-II, pp. 213 ff., 363 ff. T. H. Robinson, Poetry and Poets of the Old Testament (1947), pp. 67 ff. Lindblom, cf. vol. I, p. 181, n. 3, and Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift 1940. Stevenson, The Poem of Job (1947) (The Schweich Lectures for 1943), stresses the conflict between the "folk-tale" (beginning and ending of the book) and the poetical parts. - Irwin, Job and Prometheus, in The Journal of Religion 1950, pp. 90 ff.; Rowley, Submission in Suffering (1951), esp. pp. 58 ff., 63 ff.

There is an edition of the *Ethiopic text* by Pereira. - Cf. also Gerleman, Studies in the Septuagint I (1946). - On the LXX, see I, p. 68. - Baumgartner, in The OT and Modern Study, pp. 216 ff.

## THE SONG OF SOLOMON

The first verse of the book translates the Hebrew superlative *šir hašširim*, "The song of songs". This was the basis for Luther's translation *Das Hohelied*, imitated by translations resting on his Bible (Danish, Höjsangen, Swedish, Höga visan). Greek and Latin translations slavishly copy the Hebrew words.

The superscription 1,1 also contains the name of the traditionally supposed author, *Solomon*. This rests on the tradition from 1 Ki. 5,12. In the book itself Solomon is mentioned 1,5; 3,7,9,11; 8,11. The language of the book speaks strongly against his authorship. It contains too many *Aramaisms*, e.g. 1,12; 2,7 etc. 4,13 we encounter an *Iranian* loan-word *pardes*, and in 3,9 we find a *Graecism*, 'appirjon, phoreion. In 4,4 some explain *talpījôt* as a transliteration of *telôpia*. In its present form the book accordingly belongs to the *Greek period*. But it may contain older material. 6,4, cf. 1 Ki. 14,17; 15,21 etc., mentions the royal city of the Northern kingdom, *Tirzah*. But this does not with certainty indicate so early a date of that poem, for also later

ages know the city<sup>1)</sup>. The literary character of the book<sup>2)</sup> proves that it cannot be assigned to a definite historical period. As love lyrics it is timeless.

### History of Interpretation.

The 8 chapters are the *festal Megillah for Passover*<sup>3)</sup>. The *rabbis* discussed its right of being a Canonical book<sup>4)</sup>.

At first glance nobody can doubt that the book contains love poetry, and that it may be divided into a series of loosely connected greater and smaller poems. But the position of the book among the Sacred Writings through centuries has led the interpreters into other ways of understanding.

The *allegorical* interpretation found in it an expression of the relations between *Yahweh and Israel*<sup>5)</sup>, or between *Christ and the Church*<sup>6)</sup>. During the *Middle Ages Mysticism* reads the Song as a description of the relations between *Christ and the individual soul*<sup>7)</sup>. Most Roman-Catholic interpreters still adhere to this theory<sup>8)</sup>. In Protestant theology it was still maintained by *Hengstenberg* (1853) and in recent times by *Kuhn*<sup>9)</sup>. *Delitzsch*, who takes up the interpretation of the book as a *drama*<sup>10)</sup>, applies also a *typological* interpretation, which draws very near to allegory. Solomon is seen as a type of Christ.

The allegorical interpretation has however not been sole regnant. *Ibn Ezra*<sup>11)</sup> repelled the mystical interpretation. *Theodore of Mopsuestia* was condemned in Constantinople 553 for not subscribing to the allegorical interpretation. In 1545 *Calvin* expelled *Castellio* from Geneva on account of his opinions concerning the book, and 1567 *Luis de Leon* was tried by the Inquisition on similar grounds<sup>12)</sup>.

The allegorical interpretation as always rests upon an *eisegesis*. A priori it cannot be repelled. Allegorical use of love-poetry is otherwise attested

<sup>1)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 535.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 128ff.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. p. 163. — See *Gaster*, *Passover* (1949), p.p 87ff.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 29f. and p. 132.

<sup>5)</sup> So the *rabbis*.

<sup>6)</sup> So the Church Fathers with a few exceptions.

<sup>7)</sup> Especially in the famous homilies of *Bernard of Clairvaux*.

<sup>8)</sup> according to the preface to *Kalt's* commentary (1933), cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 533, n. 1.

<sup>9)</sup> *Erklärung des Buches Koheleth* (1926), pp. 3 ff. *Erklärung des Hohen Liedes* (1926).

<sup>10)</sup> cf. below.

<sup>11)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 9, II, p. 10 f.

<sup>12)</sup> *Haller-Calling*, p. 23.



in the OT<sup>1</sup>). But the examples from Is. 5 and Ez. 16 and 23 show that the erotic poems here are used outside their proper sphere. And that is also the case with the allegorical use of the Song of Songs.

The 18th and 19th centuries turn away from this understanding. The book is still taken as a unity, and the prevailing theory is that the book is a *drama* – an understanding represented in Antiquity by Origen and now taken up by Renan (1850) and Ewald (1867). But the many possibilities advanced to explain the book in this way proves its impossibility<sup>2</sup>). The dramatic theory finds as the lover a shepherd singing to his beloved. He is either identified with the king, or the king is introduced as the rival of the shepherd. Gebhardt<sup>3</sup>) understood the book as a *mimos* in the style of the works of Theocritus, a play enacted with different voices by one single actor. But all this is quite arbitrary, as Reuss already has shown.

The unity of the book was given up first by Theodore of Mopsuestia and in our times by Herder<sup>4</sup>), Goethe<sup>5</sup>), Reuss<sup>6</sup>), and P. Haupt<sup>7</sup>). They regard the book as an anthology of love-poems, according to different divisions between 12 and 30 pieces. This view was supported by material from Syrian wedding ceremonies, collected by Wetzstein when he was Prussian consul in Damascus<sup>8</sup>). He described how the bridal pair is enthroned as king and queen on the threshing-sledge and is praised by dances, songs and music. The descriptions of the bodily beauty of the bride and bridegroom are of great importance<sup>9</sup>). Since then many parallels have been collected both from the modern Orient and from antiquity<sup>10</sup>).

Recently a *cult-mythological interpretation* is coming to the fore<sup>11</sup>). This does not mean that the allegorical interpretation is taken up again. The

<sup>1</sup>) Is. 5, 1 ff., cf. vol. I, p. 179 ff., cf. p. 134. Cf. the drastic chapters of Ez., 16 and 23.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. Reuss, *Das Alte Testament V* (1893), pp. 324 ff. where the different contradicting arrangements of the book are confronted in a very illuminating way with one another.

<sup>3</sup>) *Das Lied der Lieder* (1931).

<sup>4</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 11.

<sup>5</sup>) *Noten zum westöstlichen Diwan* (1819) (cf. p. 183, n. 8).

<sup>6</sup>) cf. n. 3.

<sup>7</sup>) *Biblische Liebeslieder* (1907).

<sup>8</sup>) *Die syrische Dreschtafel*, in *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1873), pp. 270 ff., cf. further Budde in *Preussische Jahrbücher* 1894, pp. 92 ff.

<sup>9</sup>) the *wasf*, cf. vol. I, p. 129.

<sup>10</sup>) cf. vol. I.

<sup>11</sup>) cf. vol. I. – and now Engnell, *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*, who seems to think that its cultic relation was the ground for the retention in the canon by the rabbis, so also Widengren, in *Religion och Bibel* (Nathan Söderblomsällskapets Årsbok), 1948, pp. 17 ff. I cannot see that W. adduces new proofs altering my results, vol. I, p. 131 ff.

wedding songs are connected with the *hieros gamos* of Oriental fertility cult. From this environment they were taken over into the old Israelite spring festival of *Mazzoth*. The *Sulamith* (7,1) then perhaps is the fertility goddess herself, not the ordinary bride of the wedding festival in the village, and the *dod* is the king as the cult-representative of the young God.

It is not easy to understand how and when poems of *this kind* have been preserved in the passover ritual in spite of the strong anti-Canaanite reaction of the 9th-6th centuries. We have here to count upon too many uncontrollable intermediate links. We have to retain the opinion that they – as we find them in the present book – are love poems, which according to *Akiba* (ca. 130 A.D.) were sung in as “profane” places as taverns, which the rabbi fervently opposes. The truth of the cultic interpretation concerns their pre-history.

Concerning the authors we cannot say anything. A couple of *repetitions* (2,17a, cf. 4,6a; 2,17b, cf. 8,14; 2,6-7, cf. 8,3-4) may indicate that two collections have been added to one another. But also other explanations are possible (use of identical phrases in different poems or interpolation).

– It is in reality narrow-minded to advance the question of the “theological significance of the poems”. Why not thank God, because he among the sacred books has also given us words of love?

*Commentaries*: Haller (1940, in Eissfeldt's Handbuch). Mowinkel, *Sangesang* (1919). Important is the book of Haupt from 1907, cf. above. More literature in vol. I. – Waterman, *The Song of Songs* (1948). – Baumgartner in *The OT and Modern Study*, ed. Rowley (1951), pp. 230ff. – Rowley, *The Interpretation of the Song of Songs* (in *The Suffering Servant and other Essays* (1952, pp. 187ff.).

### Contents.

The scene of the “historical novel”<sup>1)</sup> of *Naomi* and *Ruth*, divided into 4 chapters and being the *megillah* of the *Feast of Weeks*, is laid by the author in the time of the *Judges*.

*Elimelech* from Bethlehem, his wife *Naomi*, and their sons *Mahlon* and *Chilion* emigrate to Moab during a famine. The sons marry Moabite women, *Orpah* and *Ruth*. After the death of all the men the widow *Naomi* returns to Judah, accompanied to the frontier by *Orpah*, to Bethlehem by *Ruth*, who refuses to leave her mother-in-law and wholly gives herself up to the people and the God of *Naomi*. The two destitute women earn their living by gleaning corn in the fields of *Naomi's* kinsman *Boaz*, who treats *Ruth* kindly. On the advice of *Naomi* *Ruth* reminds *Boaz* of his duty as *go'el* (a discreet variant of the motive of Gen. 19,30ff. and 38). This is followed by the account of an interesting discussion in court with another *go'el*, who resigns his privileges and his duties. *Boaz* marries *Ruth* and so becomes the ancestor of *David*. The book ends with a *genealogy*, pointing out this fact. As usual, accordingly, the book is named after its main character. The author is anonymous.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 240 and 241.

## Position in the Canon.

According to the historical setting of the book the LXX and consequently the ecclesiastical Bibles place the book after the Book of Judges. According to *Baba bathra* 14 b it has also been written in this age. But nevertheless Jewish tradition places the book among the Hagiographa, among the Five Megilloth. *Haller*<sup>1)</sup> presumes that this is an arrangement later than the Talmudic tradition of *Baba bathra*, which places it before the Psalms.

## Integrity.

The conclusion 4, 17b–22 is generally considered a late addition, vv. 18–22 being a parallel to 1 Chr. 2,4–15 and possibly an imitation of this passage, or coming from the same source. *Gunkel* and others also excise v. 17<sup>2)</sup>. 4,18–22 is often regarded as a gloss to 4,17 or 4,12. This means that the connection between the plot of the book and David's person is a later addition. But at least it is improbable that v. 17 is added. For the style of such narratives, cf. the older parallels Gen. 25 and 38, demands an account of the naming of the child. It is quite impossible to assume that a later interpolator would fabricate the tradition of David's extraction from Moab<sup>3)</sup>. Perhaps the clumsiness of the verse is due to textual corruption<sup>4)</sup>.

## Tendency.

Modern history of literature, represented by *Gunkel*<sup>5)</sup> and *Gressmann*<sup>6)</sup>, regards the book as a "short story" ("Novelle")<sup>7)</sup>, praising the fidelity of a woman, but refuses to find any other tendency in the book. The narrator only aims at entertaining his audience. On the other hand, *Goethe*<sup>8)</sup>, while stressing the high poetic character of the narrative, also notes the tendency to find good ancestors for David. Against this *Rudolph* maintains that the OT generally does not exhibit any tendency of this kind, and that the praise

<sup>1)</sup> in his commentary, p. VII.

<sup>2)</sup> see RGG, 1st ed., col. 107. *Eissfeldt*, p. 537 f., *Rudolph's* commentary, ad loc., p. 36. *Peters*, Theol. Revue 1914, p. 449, cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 718.

<sup>3)</sup> *Rudolph*, p. 7.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. Syr. and Vulg. (*Rudolph*).

<sup>5)</sup> in both editions of the RGG.

<sup>6)</sup> SAT I, 2, 2nd. ed. (1922).

<sup>7)</sup> cf. above, p. 182, n. I.

<sup>8)</sup> *Noten zum Westöstlichen Diwan* (Werke.. ausgewählt... von E. Schmidt, VI (1914)), p. 375 f.



of fidelity of the wife or the widow, as supposed by *Gunkel* and *Gressmann*, is also conceived in too modern forms. It would be more in accord with OT analogy to assume a practical aim in the book, such as an *admonition to keep the law of the levirate*<sup>1)</sup>. Others regard the book as *polemical* against the strict claims to observe the *separation from the heathen women* in the time of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* – probably the most widespread assumption, making the book a parallel to the universalistic attitude of the book of *Jonah* and antagonistic to e.g. *Esther* and *Judith*. But *Rudolph*<sup>2)</sup> maintains that it is very difficult to find this tendency in the book. What may be said is that the book is friendly to foreign nations, but does not labour to win them for the religion of Israel. It does not rebuke *Orpah* for returning to her own people. *Rudolph* thinks that the book will show that the man or woman who places himself or herself under the protection of Israel's God (2,12) is richly rewarded by him. Further *Rudolph* underlines that *Naomi*, who is not described as an ideal woman, is depicted as an example of the fact that Yahweh acts surprisingly to those of little faith (cf. Ps. 113,9). Following hints by *Gunkel*, *Rudolph* therefore regards the book as a *parallel to Gen. 24* or the *history of Joseph*, tactfully and without pointer stressing the guidance of Yahweh in the lives of its main persons. –

I think that *Rudolph* pays too little attention to the fact that when *Ruth* surrenders herself completely to the God of Israel this is an effect of her fidelity to her mother-in-law<sup>3)</sup>.

Recently a *cultic* interpretation of the book has been attempted<sup>4)</sup>. Behind the book, which is thought to aim at making the Jews who after 587 fled to Moab return, is assumed a cult-legend from *Bethlehem*, the town having its name after the Sumerian God *Lachmu*. In later times *Jerome* knows an Adonis-cult in Bethlehem, and the names of the dramatis personae of the book are interpreted in connection with the vegetation cults, *Naomi* e.g. in connection with the name of Adonis, *Na'amān*. *Rudolph*<sup>5)</sup> rightly characterizes this phantastic interpretation as a relapse into the best days of pan-Babylonism. The whole idea is spun out of harmless names<sup>6)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> *Bertholdt*, Einl. V, 2 (1816), p. 2357g.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 10.

<sup>3)</sup> That *Orpah* is not expressly rebuked is a doubtful argumentum e silentio. The rebuke may be a tacit one.

<sup>4)</sup> *W. E. Staples*, Am. Journ. of Sem. Lang. and Lit. 1936, pp. 145ff. *Haller*, p. 2f.

<sup>5)</sup> p. 8.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 719.

## Date.

For the dating of the book it is important that it looks back upon the "time of the Judges" in a manner reminding us of the framework of the Book of Judges, generally supposed to be deuteronomistic, i.e. late pre-exilic or still later. The crucial question is the *relation between 4,7 and Deut. 25,9*. Often 4,7 is understood as presupposing Deut. 25,9, the custom described there having fallen into disuse. This is combined with the theory that the book has connection with the discussions concerning the mixed marriages in the 5th century. Rudolph<sup>1</sup>) on the other hand thinks that Deut. 25,9 at most may be called a re-interpretation of "the manner in former time" (4,7), so that a *pre-deuteronomic* date of the book might be possible<sup>2</sup>). Jer 32 does not – in its detailed description of a bargain – allude to the custom of the shoe. The relations between Deut. 25,9 and 4,7 may be explained so that Deut. tries to revive an ancient custom. The *Aramaisms* in the book are not numerous enough to account for a late date.

Pre-exilic origin is accordingly a possibility not to be treated too lightly. On the other hand it cannot with certainty be asserted that the difference between 4,6 and Deut. 25,9 makes it necessary to place the book before Deuteronomy. Eissfeldt seems right in maintaining that the "universalism" of the book, its friendly attitude towards the foreign nations, is best understood in circles like those forming the background of the Book of Jonah. Further, the treatment of the motive known from Gen. 19,30ff. and Gen. 38 appears so refined that it must come from a time separated from the old days of the Genesis-legends by a wide space of time. This is also supported by the retrospective words pointing back to the days of the Judges. But it will be wise not to constrain oneself to a too narrow period. The time from the later periods of the monarchy down into post-exilic days is the land of wide possibility, with which we have to reckon<sup>3</sup>).

## Historical Character.

A book which most probably cannot be earlier than the later periods of the Israelite-Judaean monarchy, cannot be expected to give much reliable evidence concerning days so far off as the time of the Judges. The only moment of historical importance may be a tradition of *David's Moabite ancestry*, and

<sup>1</sup>) cf. Gressmann, op. cit. p. 275.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. S. R. Driver, Introduction, pp. 454ff.

<sup>3</sup>) For a comparatively early date speaks – in my opinion – the arguments in the article by Vriezen on Ruth 4,5 in Oudtestamentische Studien V, 1948, pp. 80–88.

accordingly the main part of the story of Ruth's marriage may be good history. But the artistic development of the theme is the work of the poet.

The commentaries of Haller (1940) and Rudolph (1939) have been mentioned repeatedly. In a paper in *The Harvard Theological Review*, H.H. Rowley (1947, pp. 77 ff.) with the display of his great learning, has treated the problems concerning the marriage of Ruth in a most thorough way. The literature massed in the notes gives a very exhaustive bibliography.

## THE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH

### The Name.

"The Lamentations" is a *Latin* rendering of the Greek *Thrénoi*. In *Hebrew* manuscripts and prints the book like other Biblical writings is named through its first word, *'ekah*, used in ch. 1, 2, and 4 as catchword of the style of the *funeral dirge*<sup>1)</sup>. In *Baba bathra* 15a we have preserved a Hebrew title, *kinot*, "funeral dirges", corresponding to the Greek title. The Greek form is often used in transcribed form *Threni* in Latin. The versions usually add that *Jeremiah* is the author. Modern translations, like the Swedish and the modern Danish, take over the German superscription from *Luther*, translating the Latin title (*Die Klagelieder*).

### Contents.

The book has 5 chapters, each containing one lamentation. The four first are *alphabetic*<sup>2)</sup>.

In 1-3 three lines are grouped under one letter, but only in ch. 3 all the three lines in a group begin with the same letter. Ch. 4 has two lines under each letter, only the first line beginning with the letter, which is to be used according to the order of the alphabet. Ch. 5 is not alphabetic, but "alphabetizing", the ch. containing 22 verses, the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. The poems do not use the same order of the letters. Ch. 1 places *'ajin* before *pē*, while 2-4 reverse this order.

The poems all speak of the *catastrophe of 587*, the fall of Jerusalem. Allusions like 2,7,9; 4,17 (cf. Jer. 37,5) and 4,19-20 (cf. 2 Ki. 25,4-7) and 5,2-9 gives us concrete features connecting the poems with the catastrophe. Chs. 1 and 3 are of a more stereotyped character.

The form in 1-2 and 4 is the *funeral dirge*, here used allegorically of the fate of Jerusalem<sup>3)</sup>. Ch. 3 uses the style of the *individual psalm* of lamentation,

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 135.

<sup>2)</sup> On this device, used in Wisdom literature and certain psalms, cf. vol. I, p. 176.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 138. Eissfeldt, p. 545, speaks of a "political funeral dirge", cf. the use of the same style in the prophets, vol. I, p. 137f.



ch. 5 that of the *national* psalm.<sup>1)</sup> In the "individual" poem in ch. 3, however, the form of the national psalm comes in a manner also known from the psalms in vv. 40–47, probably testifying to the character of the psalm as a *royal psalm*<sup>2)</sup>. The subject of the poem is here a person identifying himself with the people.

#### Position in the Canon.

The general order of the Hagiographa brings Lam. after Ruth and before Eccles., while *Baba bathra* 14b places it after the latter and the Song of Songs and before Dan. An earlier stage in the development of the massora<sup>3)</sup> has it between Eccl. and Esth. The *versions* follow the tradition of Jeremiah as the author and place it after Jer. in the second part of the collection of writings.

#### The traditional Theory of Authorship.

The tradition of *Jeremiah* as the poet behind the book is not found in the Hebrew text, but as just mentioned in the translations, cf. also *Baba bathra* 15a. The contents of the book support the tradition, only in so far as the book obviously is a work of his time. And the tradition cannot be maintained. The different forms of the alphabet used in chs. 1 and 2 ff (cf. above) make it probable that there are different authors, and words like 2,9 and 5,7, that the prophets did not find visions from God and that the ancestors were guilty of the punishment, can hardly have been conceived by Jeremiah. This prophet has not placed his hope in the Egyptians (cf. 4,17).

The *origin of the tradition* is probably 2 Chron. 35,25, that Jeremiah has composed a dirge on *Josiah*, which was preserved among the "Lamentations", this being understood of our collection. We know further that Jewish tradition understood 4,20 as an allusion to Josiah, and likewise 1,18<sup>4)</sup>. The anonymous poets are people who have lived through the catastrophes in *Palestine*.

*Rudolph* has – based upon an uncertain argumentum e silentio – attempted to place ch. 1, which on other grounds must be ascribed to a special author (cf. above), in 597.

#### The Place in Life.

The tradition of the Synagogue combines the poems with the lament on the destruction of Jerusalem. The book is *megillah for the 9th of Ab*. Already

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 154.

<sup>2)</sup> vol. I, p. 147f. – cf. *Engnell*, Svenskt Bibliiskt Uppslagsverk I.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. *Biblia Hebraica*, ed. Kittel, 3rd ed.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Rudolph's* commentary, p. 9. –

Zech. 7,1ff. and 8,18f. know fast days in remembrance of the destruction of the temple, and after 70 A.D. this custom is combined with the remembrance days for the burning of the temple by *Titus*. It is very probable that the poems have been composed for use at such mourning services<sup>1)</sup>. On the other hand it cannot be proved that they have originated in Babylon<sup>2)</sup>. They seem to come fresh from the impression of the catastrophes, perhaps with the exception of ch. 5.<sup>3)</sup>.

*Rudolph's* commentary (1939) brings an exhaustive list of literature, up to the date of his book. Cf. also *Haller's* exposition in *Eissfeldt's* Handbuch.

There is an edition of the *Ethiopic text* by *Bachmann*.

## ECCLESIASTES

### Name.

The superscription 1,1 calls the book "The words of the Preacher, the son of David, king in Jerusalem". "*The Preacher*" is a rendering of the Hebrew *kohélet*, in Greek *ekklesiastés*, Latin *concinator*, often supplemented with the name "of Solomon" instead of the "son of David" etc. of the superscription.

The Hebrew word is also found in 1,2,12; 12,8,9,19. The form is the *feminine*, but in the passages just mentioned the word is combined with the masculine. An exception to this rule is 7,29, but this is certainly a textual error, because the word here originally had the article, which erroneously was joined to the preceding verb. The feminine form is explained by reference to the fact that words signifying a function, a title and the like, often – in several languages – are feminine, cf. Ezra 2,55,57, and words like the Arabic *khaliph*, and the Latin majesty, excellency etc. Accordingly *kohélet* is derived from *kāhal*, signifying the leader of a congregation, and the "speaker" of the congregation. This is the idea of the versions, and this seems to be more probable than the assumption that the feminine form is due to the conception that the speaker in the book is Wisdom, often personified as a woman (cf. Prov. 8). In that case the noun ought to be combined with the masculine everywhere.

The superscription evidently identifies the speaker with *Solomon*, cf. also 1,12,16; 2,7,9. This traditional theory of the authorship is connected with the usual theory of Hebrew Wisdom, that Solomon was the author of many

<sup>1)</sup> *Engnell*, loc. cit., rightly stresses both the ritual elements and the historical background.

<sup>2)</sup> *Sellin*, Einl. (1935), p. 148, *Pfeiffer*, p. 723 also places 2 and 4 in Babylonia. Ch. 5 he dates to a later generation (v. 5) in Palestine, some time before 520, about 530.

<sup>3)</sup> *Pfeiffer*, cf. the preceding note.

of its books. As the date of the book definitely forbids us to accept the tradition of authorship (cf. below), we must assume that the anonymous sage who has composed the book has used the common device of Wisdom teachers, that the book is the work of some ancient king or minister of state<sup>1)</sup>, cf. also Prov. 31,1.

The author not only presents Ecclesiastes as speaking in the 1st pers. (1,12-18), but he also speaks of him in the 3rd person (1,2; 12,9). This might indicate that both the superscription 1,1 and the subscription 12,9-11 do not come from the author, but from later editors. Also the "one shepherd" (12,11) is probably the king, as in Accadian and, less frequently, in Egyptian and Hebrew, not God<sup>2)</sup>.

Historically interesting is it that the book gives the picture of Solomon as seen by the author and his age, one of the many pictures of Solomon which have been created by different times.<sup>3)</sup>

Concerning the place in the Canon, cf. above p. 162.

### Composition and Contents.

The book has 12 chapters. It is – as common in the wisdom books – a loose combination of sentences, but more often of "confessions"<sup>4)</sup>, narratives of the experience of the author, admonitions, more general meditations. A division into paragraphs is often difficult. The book has the usual aphoristic character of the wisdom literature. But its main point of view, the *vanitas vanitatum*, and its admonition to get the best out of "the life of thy vanity", while the moment is there (cf. 11,9, and the warning description of old age in ch. 12), is everywhere propounded with emphasis from the beginning till the end, so that we cannot doubt that everything in the book must be seen in this light.

The *contents* of the book can be summarized as follows: Life is an endless *repetition* of the same things (1,2-11), and therefore there is no hope of a change for the better. To seek wisdom only leads to grief (1,12-18). *Riches* and *pleasures*, and the toil to secure them, lead to nothing, for perhaps the property acquired must be left to a fool, and the wise and the fool have the same fate, death (ch. 2). *Woman* is a great disappointment (7,25-28). To strive for *justice* is just as meaningless as life as a whole, for there is no certainty of being happy through that. Sometimes it looks as if justice is rewarded by hap-

<sup>1)</sup> vol. I, p. 170.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. Eissfeldt, p. 552.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. the description by S. Kierkegaard, in the narrative "The Dream of Solomon", in "Stages on Life's Way". "Solomon.... became a preacher, but no man of prayer..."

<sup>4)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 175.



piness, but sometimes the experiences point the other way (8,14-9,3). And there is no hope in a *future life* in which retribution might come. For we do not know, if men and animals have different fates after death (3,16-29,-<sup>1</sup>), and what we know is that the living know more than the dead (9,4-5). The wise are not happier than the fools (2,19-21; 9,11-12). – From this pessimistic outlook the Preacher concludes that we have to *enjoy the fleeting moment*, while there is a chance, before age and death prevent us from getting the full pleasure of life (9,7-9). We must seek the happiness of married life and of work (11-12,7). Belief in *God* is not given up. But God is just as unintelligible as the world. The expressions “a gift of God”, or “from the hand of God”, mean that pleasures and riches and happiness are given by God arbitrarily. God is a whimsical despot, dropping his benefits at random among men. Therefore it is best *not to go to extremes*, then there is a chance to get through life in a satisfactory manner (7,16-18).

### Date.

The *scepticism* displayed in the book cannot come from ancient Israel. Even if such pessimism can be found in Wisdom literature outside Israel at an earlier date, it does not go well with the facts which are known to us concerning the Israelite view of life in David's and Solomon's days. While Jeremiah and Job still wrestle with the problem of man's value and his fate, the Preacher has given up the problem as insoluble and resigned. That the book must be late is affirmed by its *language*. We find purely *Aramaic* words (3,1 and 12,3), and the constructions show that the Hebrew of the book is written by a man whose thoughts move on Aramaic lines<sup>2</sup>). On the other hand, the *Graecisms* supposed in 3,12 (*'āsa ṭob*) and 2,14; 3,19; 9,2,3 (*mikreh*) are not certain. But 2,5 contains a *Persian* word (*pardes*). – The question of influence from *Greek philosophy* has not been answered satisfactorily, and the same is true concerning the assumed *Egyptian* influence.

In 4,13-16 and 10,16 some critics have found allusions to the ascension of Ptolemy V in 204. But the word *na'ar* in 10,16 does not only mean “boy”, but also “servant”; and 4,13 ff. is only one of the typical examples of the vanity of everything, from which we have no right to draw historical conclusions. With *Eissfeldt*<sup>3</sup>) we can say that it is probable that the book must be earlier than the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes which aroused Judaism so that it found itself again. The resignation of Eccles. is not compatible with the active spirit of the Maccabees or with the heroic faith in God's plan in the rule of the world found in Dan. *Nöldeke*<sup>4</sup>) assumed that Eccles. knew Eccles.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. the commentaries, ad loc. concerning the reading cf v. 21.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Delitzsch's* commentary (1875), pp. 197-210.

<sup>3</sup>) p. 556, cf. *Pfeiffer*, p. 730f.

<sup>4</sup>) quoted by *Pfeiffer*, p. 728f. – cf. next note concerning allusions in Wisd.

But the allusions are too uncertain. Therefore also this manner of establishing a terminus ad quem fails.

### Integrity.

The aphoristic form of the book warns us to be cautious in drawing too far-reaching conclusions from apparent contradictions. The climax of hyper-criticism was reached in the commentaries of *Siegfried* and *Podechard*, assuming a combination of several different "sources".

Later Judaism was very antagonistic to the scepticism of the book. It has been assumed that the apocryphal Wisdom of Solomon polemizes against the Preacher (Wisd. 2,1f.), but it cannot be called quite certain<sup>1</sup>). The rabbis discussed the canonicity of the book<sup>2</sup>).

Several sentences of the book have been understood as the attempts of later interpreters to introduce more orthodox ideas in the work, e.g. 2,26; 3,17; 7,26b; 8,5; 8,12b 13a; 11,9b; 12,7b etc. Especially the conclusion 12,12-14 has aroused suspicion. But if the admonitions of this passage are seen in the light of the rest of the book, where man is called upon to live a quiet and normal life, avoiding what may be dangerous, then there is nothing which prohibits the assumption that also these concluding admonitions come from the same hand as the rest of the book. The same is true of most of the assumed glosses, which must be read in their context of the book, not taken in their orthodox meaning.

*Commentaries:* Hertzberg (in Sellin's series, 1932) and Galling (in Eissfeldt's Handbuch (1940). Bentzen (1942) The most important work on The Preacher is the essay of *Johs. Pedersen*, Scepticisme Israélite (1931), originally in Danish in Edda 1915. - A very curious interpretation is given by *Kuhn*, in Beih. ZATW 1926: The book is a description of the world "under the sun", which must be supplemented by an allegorical interpretation of the Song of Songs as a description of the world above the sun. A similar idea is found in *Odeberg*, Qohælæth (1929). - *H. L. Ginsberg*, Studies in Koheleth (1951), cf. *Hammershaimb*, in Vetus Testamentum 1951, pp. 237f.

*Buhl*, Om Prædikerens Bog (1886).

On foreign influence: *Kleinert* in ThStKr 1883, pp. 761-82 and 1909, pp. 493-529. *Ebeling*, Ein babylonischer Qohæleth (1922)<sup>3</sup>). *Ranston*, Ecclesiastes and the early Greek Wisdom Literature (1925). *Humbert*, Recherches sur les sources Egyptiennes de la littérature Sapientiale d'Israël (1929), pp. 107ff. *Galling*, ZATW 1932, pp. 276ff. and his commentary, p. 49f. - *Pfleiderer*, Die Philosophie des Heraklit von Ephesus (1886), pp. 255ff.

Cf. further the list of literature in *Galling's* commentary and his review in Theol. Rundschau 1934. - *Baumgartner*, in The OT and Modern Study (1951), pp. 221ff.

There is an edition of the *Ethiopic* text by *Mercer*.

<sup>1</sup>) *Fichtner*, ZNTW 1937, p. 120f., and his commentary on Wisd. in Eissfeldt's Handbuch (1938), p. 15. <sup>2</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 30.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. *Th. Jacobsen*, in The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man (cf. above, p. 177, n. 4), pp. 216ff., and *É. Dhorme*, in Rev. Bibl. 1923 = Recueil É. Dhorme (1951), pp. 685ff.

## ESTHER

## Contents.

The 10 chapters contain a very intricate story of how the Jewish girl *Esther*, who after the divorce of king *Xerxes* from queen *Vashti* has become queen, saves her people from a pogrom planned by the king's vizier *Haman*.

His actions are promoted by his hate towards the cousin and guardian of Esther, *Mordecai*, deported by Nebuchadnezzar in 597. As a festival of remembrance of the salvation of the Jews the festival of *Purim* is introduced. The plot of the book is complicated by the act of *Mordecai* to save the Persian king from an attempt on his life, which makes the king order *Haman* to exalt the hated Jew on the king's horse, not on the gallows prepared by the minister.

## Unhistorical Character of the Book.

It is quite improbable that *Mordecai*, deported in 597 can have lived on under *Xerxes* (Ahasuerus) (485-465). Many features of the book are of a fairy-tale-character, known from other works, e.g. the motive of the king wanting to show his beautiful wife to other men, cf. the well-known story of Gyges in Herod. I, 8-13. On the other hand the description of the circumstances of living in the book seems partly to be well attested *history of culture*. The story-teller knows something of the *administration* of the Persian kingdom, and especially of the construction of the *palace of Shushan*. The *tension* between Jews and Gentiles is an historical feature, and finally the same is the case with the *Purim-festival*, the aetiology of which is given by the legend of the book.

The book may be called an *historical novel*<sup>1)</sup> used to account for the festival.

A *mythological* background was supposed by P. Jensen<sup>2)</sup> and H. Zimmern<sup>3)</sup>, the plot being originally a story of *Marduk's* and *Ishtar's* victory over the Elamitic gods *Human* and *Mashti*, combined with the well-known myth of the victory of Marduk over the Chaos. But these combinations of names are unnecessary. In the present tale the names are not names of gods, and it is not certain that they have originally been names of gods, for e.g. *Mardocai* may be a Babylonian theophoric name, and *Esther* may not be identical with the goddess of fertility, but her name may only mean "Star" (cf. Stella as a feminine name).<sup>4)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 240 and 265, cf. p. 247.

<sup>2)</sup> Wiener Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 1892, pp. 47ff.

<sup>3)</sup> in the 3rd ed. of Schrader, Die Keilschriften und das Alte Testament (1903), pp. 515-20.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. A. S. Kapelrud, in Svenskt Bibliiskt Uppslagsverk. - G. R. Driver doubts the Babylonian character of the name *Mardocai*, and refers to Scheftelowitz (Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judent. 1903, pp. 313ff.), who thinks it is Sanskrit *mrduka*, "kindly", "gentle".



The story probably originated in the *Eastern diaspora*, and its background is the brilliant career of certain Jews (cf. e.g. Nehemiah) in the service of the Persian court, and the envy which it might arouse among the gentiles.

The connection with the festival of *Purim* and the festival itself are not without problems. The combination of the book and the festival we find in 3,7 and 9,20–32. The word *pur* was treated by the author as a foreign word, for he translated it. Pfeiffer thinks that it may be an invention of the author himself as the whole story<sup>1)</sup>, but a combination with Assyrian *puru*, lot, may be possible. All conjectures on the origin of the festival, e.g. its combination with the Babylonian festival of the *Sakaia*<sup>2)</sup> or the Persian *Farvardigān*<sup>3)</sup> are very problematical<sup>4)</sup>. We do not know much of the Jews in these Eastern regions, and it is therefore very difficult to find a background for the festival here outside the realm of imagination.

#### Date.

As *Xerxes* and his times (485–465) in the book apparently belong to a past relatively remote, so that legend already has taken possession of this king, we cannot presume that the book is a work from the early Persian period. The festival of *Purim* has not been known in Palestine until the 2nd century B.C. 2 Macc. 15,36 mentions the *Day of Nicanor* in connection with the *Day of Mardocai*, while the book of *Ecclus.* (ca. 180) does not know *Esther* and her cousin. It is possible that the festival existed in the Eastern diaspora and after 180 began to be celebrated in Palestine. Pfeiffer<sup>5)</sup> places the book in the time after *Antiochus Epiphanes*, as an expression of the feelings of militant Jews in the time of *John Hyrcanus* (135–104 B.C.). “The success of this brilliant hoax is due to the fact that the story and the festival expressed so exactly the popular feelings in the reign of John Hyrcanus: Hurrah for the Jews: Death to the heathen! Moreover, the masses never object to joyous banquets, riotous merrymaking, and Mardi Gras revelry”<sup>6)</sup>. But even this cannot be called more certain than a date in the 3rd century.

<sup>1)</sup> Pfeiffer, pp. 745ff.; but cf. Baumgartner, *Theol. Zeitschr.* Basel 1948, p. 354; Haller, in *Eisfeldt's Handbuch*, p. 115 with reference to *Winckler*, *Altort. Forsch.* II, p. 334.

<sup>2)</sup> Jensen and Zimmern.

<sup>3)</sup> J. von Hammer, in *Wiener Jahrb. f. Literatur* 1872, and Paul de Lagarde, *Purim* (1887), cf. Pfeiffer, pp. 744ff. <sup>4)</sup> Pfeiffer, p. 745. See also Gunkel, *Esther*, notes 521 and 523. <sup>5)</sup> p. 745.

<sup>6)</sup> A date in the time of the Maccabees has also been proposed by Willrich, *Judaica* (1900, pp. 1–28), and P. Haupt, *Purim* (1907). – I. Lévy (*Actes du XXI Congrès des Orientalistes* (1949)) proposes a date not before Claudius, the story of Vasti and Xerxes being a reflection of that of Herodes and Marianne.

## Integrity.

9,19 looks like the well-known conclusion of *etiological legends*<sup>1)</sup>. But then follows a long passage which neither in respect of language nor of contents is well related to the preceding material. The language of 9,20–32 is more twisted than that of the corpus of the book, and regarding the contents we note that the difference made between the days of celebrations in the towns and in the countryside in the preceding part of the chapter is not kept up in 9,20–32, where it is enjoined that all have to celebrate the festival both on the 14th and the 15th of Adar. This might indicate that these verses are a later addition, giving justification for a change in the practice of the festival<sup>2)</sup>. Similar considerations may apply to 10,1–3<sup>3)</sup>: The Chronicle-style of these verses does not go well with the romance-character of the story.

## The Religious Character of the Book.

In later times the book has been expanded still more. *Greek* tradition (LXX) has a series of *additions* (prayers and the like), all aiming at giving the book a more *religious* tone<sup>4)</sup>.

A religious deepening was really needed. The book is a very unpleasant example of how persecutions and suppression have poisoned the soul of a nation, a part at least of the Jewish nation living and breathing in wishful dreams of a *revanche*. The *name of God* is not mentioned in *Esther*<sup>4a)</sup>. In 4,14 there is an allusion to God. Well known is the judgment of *Luther*<sup>5)</sup> on 2 Macc. and *Esther*: "Ich bin dem Buch und *Esther* so feind, dass ich wollte sie wären gar nicht vorhanden; denn sie judenzen zu sehr und haben viel heidnische Unart". Morally unsound is that *Esther* conceals her nationality and so secures her high position or at least avoids an unpleasant handicap. Her silence in 7,8, when the king misunderstands the position of her enemy, is an act of untruthfulness. But on the other hand we cannot overlook the description of the lonely Jewish woman taking a personal risk for her people in a critical situation. The poetical combinations between the gallows of Haman and the cross of Christ advanced by *W. Vischer* cannot save the book from *Luther's* criticism. But when the book in Rabbinic times was questioned with

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 235ff. <sup>2)</sup> So *Eissfeldt* after *Bertheau* and *Steuernagel*, cf. also *Pfeiffer*, p. 377.

<sup>3)</sup> *Eissfeldt* and *Pfeiffer*, loc. cit. <sup>4)</sup> See below, p. 231. <sup>4a)</sup> *G. R. Driver* (by letter) points to 6,1 in the LXX, as "a far older interpretation" than the MT.

<sup>5)</sup> in the *Tischreden*, Weimarer Ausgabe, vol. 22. p. 2080.

regard to its canonicity it was not its bad morals, but its apparent deviations from the Law which gave the cause<sup>1</sup>). But that the book is written with an edifying aim is manifest, even if *we* do not find it edifying.

*Literature.* The commentary of Haller (1940). Important also that of Paton (Intern. Crit. Comm., 1908). Hoschander, *The Book of Esther in the light of History* (1923). Fundamental for the understanding of the literary character is Gunkel, *Esther* (Religions-geschichtliche Volksbücher, 1916), cf. also his article in the RGG, 2nd ed. – W. Vischer, *Esther* (Theologische Existenz heute, 1937). Mowinkel, *Det gamle testamente som Guds ord* (1938), p. 104f.

There is an edition of the *Ethiopic* text by Pereira. – I. Lévy (cf. p. 193, n. 6) assumes that *Greek* was the original language of *Esther*.

## DANIEL<sup>1a</sup>)

### The Legends.

#### *Their Independence and their Interdependence.*

The 12 chapters of the book are divided into two distinct sections, the *legends* of Daniel and his companions, (1–6), and the *visions* of Daniel (7–12). But the two sections overlap in so far as 1–7 are mainly in *Aramaic* (see below), 8–12 in *Hebrew*.

In chs. 1–6 several inconsistencies and e.g. the fact which caused much racking of the brain among older interpreters, that Daniel does not appear in ch. 3<sup>2</sup>), show that the *legends* were originally independent narratives, which have been collected by later story tellers to a cycle of legends<sup>3</sup>). The date of 1,1–2 does not correspond to 2,1. The behaviour of Nebuchadnezzar in ch. 4 is not consistent with his experiences in the preceding chapters. In each chapter he starts as a gentile and is converted to reverence for the God of Israel. Further, some of the legends are variations of the same motif, e.g. chs. 2 and 4, 3 and 6, cf. also the apocryphal story of Bel and the Dragon<sup>4</sup>).

On the other hand a series of phenomena in 1–6 shows that these legends have been united and unified. Ch. 5 looks back to ch. 4 (5,20, cf. 4,6). In ch. 2, where Daniel is the main Jewish actor, the friends are nevertheless mentioned.

The legends are from ch. 2,4b on written in *Aramaic*.

We accordingly have to regard 1–6 as a *cycle of legends*, admonishing the hearers to keep faithful to the Jewish religion. But the *dream* in ch. 7, being in *Aramaic*, seems to be connected with them in some way or other.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 30f. – <sup>1a</sup>) cf. all references to my commentary in HBAT should be understood of the 2nd ed.

<sup>2</sup>) so already in the commentary of Hippolytus.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 234 and 248ff. <sup>4</sup>) below, p. 230.



*Their Integrity and their traditional Date.*

Traces of later work on the legends seem to indicate that they have not been transmitted to us in their complete, original form. This is especially the case in *ch. 2, 41-43*, where – in the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream – we have two elements, of which one has no corresponding feature in the dream itself. Vv. 41-42 describes the last world empire as consisting of iron and clay mixed together to symbolize its weakness. V. 43 carries this interpretation further on by alluding to political matrimonies concluded between princes in order to solve political difficulties. The latter verse looks like an actualisation of the former passages, alluding to events of 252 and 193 (cf. 11, 7, 17). If this is right the legend has got its present form after one of the two dates mentioned, while the original legend was created after the death of Alexander the Great in 323, for v. 41, belonging to the earlier part of the story, presupposes the partition of his empire.

The other legends may also be understood as expressions of the sentiments of times *before the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes*. Their relatively friendly attitude towards "Nebuchadnezzar" is different from the hate to the foreign ruler, expressed in the visions. None of the kings, not even Belshazzar, is described as a persecutor of the Jews. But besides the features of v. 41, just mentioned, the *Persian*, and above all the *Greek*, loan-words (in *ch. 3*), speak decidedly for their origin in later days, in the *Greek period*.

What has been said here means that we have to repel the *traditional date* of the stories. This is corroborated by the many *historical inaccuracies* which are found in them. The date of the deportation in 1,1 ff., 606 B.C., cannot be reconciled with those given in more reliable sources. The story of Nebuchadnezzar's insanity (*ch. 4*) finds no place in the history of the great Neo-Babylonian king, such as we know it, but is evidence of a popular tradition of later date, perhaps originally belonging to traditions concerning king *Nabonidus*. *Ch. 5* is especially rich in incorrect historical features. The description of the fall of Babel given here is quite unhistorical. *Belshazzar* was not the son of Nebuchadnezzar, and he was not king, but only heir to the throne, son of Babylon's last king, *Nabonidus*, who did not belong to the dynasty of Nebuchadnezzar. It is not certain that *Belshazzar* is never styled *Šarru*<sup>1)</sup>; but he was not allowed to represent his father in the celebrations of the New Year Festival, which means that he was not king. *Belshazzar* was not killed in

<sup>1)</sup> *Alfrink*, *Biblica* (1928), pp. 187ff.; on the *Nabonidus-traditions*, see *Hildegard Lewy* in *Symbolae... Hrozny dedicatae* II, pp. 29ff., and *Baumgartner*, *ibid.* III, pp. 97ff.; my article *Der böse Fürst*, in *Studia Theologia* IV, 2.

Babylon, and Babylon was not taken by assault, but capitulated without resistance to the Persians.<sup>1)</sup> And the conqueror of Babylon was not the unhistorical *Darius the Mede* of chs. 5–6 and 9.

Against all these unhistorical features it is not relevant that we sometimes find good descriptions of the Oriental milieu. For the author here mixes up many things, e.g. titles both from Babylon and Persia in descriptions of the Babylonian court. To separate an historical nucleus is in vain. Personal names and names of localities, titles of officials and judicial customs, dates and ages given, etc. – everything is used by the story-teller to create a vivid picture, taken into the service of his *art* and his *religious aim*. And those features have been further developed in the LXX (e.g. in 3,1 and 4,1).

### The Visions.

While the legends tell stories of Daniel and his companions, the *visions* (7–12) give themselves as *words of Daniel* (“I, Daniel” in 7,28, 8,2,5,27; 9,2; 12,5). But they have been combined with the narrative of the book by means of verses (7,1; 10,1) speaking of Daniel in the 3rd. person. Further a difference is made between ch. 7 as a “*dream*” and 8–12 as “*visions*”. This might support an assumption that ch. 7 originally rounded off the book of legends, while 8–12 were added as interpretations by the compiler of the present book (cf. below). The revelations are *dated*, ch. 7 in the first year of Belshazzar, 8 in his 3rd year, ch. 9 in the first year of Darius, and 10–12 in the 3rd year of Cyrus.

The *visions* – especially chs. 8 and 10 – give to some extent the impression of being real experiences, not purely literary products.<sup>2)</sup> But there must be a great deal also of the latter in them, as in Apocalyptic upon the whole<sup>3)</sup>.

When trying to interpret the visions in the book of Daniel it is important to underline that they all have a *common horizon* in history<sup>4)</sup>. All the dreams

<sup>1)</sup> The Nabonidus-Chronicle and the cylinder of Cyrus, see AOT, pp. 368–370, cf. Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*, pp. 480ff.

<sup>2)</sup> Hölscher, *Die Profeten* (1914), pp. 15 and 26ff., refers to 8,17ff. and 10,2–19, but see as a corrective Tor Andrä, *Mystikens psykologi*, (1926), pp. 249ff.

<sup>3)</sup> The great material of traditional kind contained in the visions is hardly possible in “genuine” visions, cf. Mosbech, *Fortolkningen af Johannes Aabenbaring i Fortid og Nutid* (1934), p. 105f., Lindblom, *Studia Theologica* I, Riga 1935, pp. 16 and 27, against Torm, *Die Psychologie der Pseudonymität* (1932), pp. 20ff., who thinks that the author was a visionary: This is very possible, but it does not prove the “genuineness” of the visions in all their different parts.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. Kamphausen, *Daniel und die neuere Geschichtsforschung* (1893), against e.g. Lagarde, in *Götting. Gel. Anzeigen* 1891, p. 506.

and visions in chs. 2 and 7-12 tell the history of the future down to the same point in history, the moment when the last great tribulation for the people of God and God's decisive victory is imminent. And there is a strong connection between them all. Chs. 7 and 8, both speaking of a symbolical "little horn", look as if ch. 8 were a commentary on 7. On the other hand, ch. 8 is related to 9-12 through the idea of "the abominations" or "the transgression of desolation" and kindred expressions. This means that all visions must have dated the great tribulation to the same time. Ch. 11 definitely says that the great tribulation is the persecution of the Jewish religion, started by *Antiochus Epiphanes* in the year of 167 B.C. This means that the common horizon of the visions in history is indicated by these events. The *date* of the visions is given at the transition from historical to unhistorical events in 11,49-40.

#### The Date of the complete Book.

The brief analysis of the material in Dan. now given has made it probable that the complete book has been written after the year 167 B.C. Besides the internal arguments from historical observations the arguments of the *language* and the *external* arguments are arrayed to contest the traditional date of the book.

As noted above, *Darius the Mede* in chs. 5-6 and 9 is one of the main unhistorical features in the book. In ch. 9,1 he is said to be a *son of Xerxes* and in 10,1 the *predecessor of Cyrus*. In spite of all attempts to identify him with some contemporary of Cyrus he is a quite unhistorical figure, introduced in the book together with the just as unhistorical *Median world empire* between Babylon and Persia, because it was believed that Is. 13,17; 21,2, and Jer. 51,11, 28 predicted that Babylon would be conquered by the Medes, not by the Persians.<sup>1)</sup> In this way the author succeeds in satisfying the claims of the world-period-theory for 4 empires, the *Babylonian*, *Median*, *Persian*, and the *Greek* empires. The interpretation that the fourth kingdom is the *Roman* empire, the Median consequently being identified with the Persian, is found on *Jewish* soil for the first time in 4 *Esdras* 12,10-12 (after 70 A.D.). Here this interpretation is expressly stated to be a novel understanding. On the other hand, the *Sibylline Oracles* (III, 397) from ca. 140 B.C. have expressly identified the last empire with the Greek kingdom of Alexander.<sup>2)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> Maybe there is a confusion of the three Persian kings of the name Darius, *Irwin*, in *Journal of Religion* 1940, p. 339.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. my commentary, and to all the problems touched upon here the exhaustive treatment in *Rowley*, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (1935).



Mentioning the Sibylline oracles we have entered the landmarks of *external evidence* for the late date of the book. It must have been written *before 140 B. C.* But before pursuing this line we must stress that also *internal evidence* makes it possible to fix a *terminus ad quem*.

While the book knows the beginning of the persecution in 167, it does not reveal knowledge of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes in *April 163*, nor does it allude to the re-dedication of the temple in *December 164*. Between the beginning of the *Maccabean* guerilla of liberation, hinted at in 11,34 (*terminus a quo*) in 167, and the re-dedication of the temple in 164 (*terminus ad quem*) the book must have been composed. A further limitation of the period has been attempted by *Bickermann*<sup>1)</sup>. It can be proved that Dan. does not know an edict from the Syrian government – quoted 2 Macc. 11,30 – putting an end to the persecution. This document, which *Bickermann* considers genuine, dates from *April 164*, i.e. 9 months before the re-dedication of the temple. Further *Bickermann* points out that Dan. 11 does not know the campaign in the East begun by Antiochus Epiphanes early in 165.<sup>2)</sup> It cannot be the war mentioned in 11,44, which does not deal with historical, but with future events. Accordingly *terminus ad quem* should be the summer of 165. *The book will then have been compiled in 166 or 165.*

But certain *traces of interpolations* seem to indicate that a part of the book is older. Such traces were found in ch. 2 (cf. above), and similar observations may be made in the chapters of visions, if ch. 7 e.g. contains an older vision which knows a *Greek empire*, but not king Antiochus Epiphanes<sup>3)</sup>.

*External evidence* affirms these results. We saw it lead us to a *terminus ad quem* before 140 B.C. (Or. Sibyll.).<sup>4)</sup> On the other hand the book is not known by *Sirach* in the list of Israel's great persons (Ecclus. 44–49), which gives us a *terminus a quo* in ca. 180 B.C. This corresponds to the position in the *Canon*, the book not having been accepted among the prophets, but among the *Hagiographa*. On the contrary, it presupposes the *Canon* of the prophets which it studies and interprets (chs. 9 and 11).

A generation ago the *linguistic proofs* played a greater rôle than now. And still, in spite of all attempts to prove their invalidity, the evidence of the

<sup>1)</sup> Der Gott der Makkabäer (1937), p. 144.

<sup>2)</sup> According to *Bickermann*, p. 144, n. 1 (1 Macc. 3,37): 147 according to the Seleucid era, i.e. autumn 166/5.

<sup>3)</sup> Concerning details, cf. my commentary, and *Hölscher*, ThStKr 1919, p. 132f. Against this see however the criticism by *Rowley* in Journ. of Theol. Studies 1937, p. 426f.

<sup>4)</sup> Later evidence, 1 Macc. 2,59f.; *Josephus*, Ant. XI, 337, accordingly is of no importance (cf. *Bleek*, 6th ed. p. 416ff.). That 3 fragments of Daniel have been found among the Dead Sea Scrolls cannot affect the date of Daniel, but Daniel's date will determine the date of the fragments (cf. *Baumgartner*, in Theol. Rundsch. 1951, s. 124),

Greek words in ch. 3,5ff. must be maintained<sup>1)</sup>. The musical instruments mentioned here refer us to Hellenistic times, *psaltérion* only occurring in and after Aristotle, and *symphonía* in the meaning of "bagpipe" not until Polybius<sup>2)</sup>. – The Aramaic language of the book in the beginning of this century was widely used in the discussion concerning the date of the book. It was maintained that the language was of Western (Palestinian), not – as it was to be expected – Eastern type. But the investigations of Schaefer<sup>3)</sup>, Ginsberg<sup>4)</sup>, and Baumgartner<sup>5)</sup> have shown that it is impossible to argue on the basis of this distinction because the Persian government-language already from the time of Darius I (ca. 500 B.C.) has influenced the Aramaic dialects so that their differences have been blotted out. But besides the proof of the Greek words one Aramaic argument can still be kept up: The use of the word "Chaldaeans" in the meaning of "astrologers". The word is in Dan. used in its original meaning, as name of the Chaldaean people, in 5,11,30; 9,1. But in 2,4 and in other places it signifies certain "Chaldaean" sages. This usage cannot have originated in Babylon, but is found in Greece, and not until the time of Herodotus, later than the traditional date of Dan. In reality therefore this usage is probably a Graecism.

### The Problem of Pseudonymity.

The date now given has of course only made itself accepted in religious circles after hard fighting. Characteristically enough it was first advanced, not by a Christian or a Jew, but by the philosopher Porphyry (ca. 270 A.D.), whose arguments have to a great extent been preserved in the commentary of Jerome (ca. 400 A.D.). Jerome of course defends the traditional view. Only the Antiochene Theodoret approaches views similar to the modern ideas coming to the light with Uriel Acosta (d. 1640), Spinoza and Newton, getting the upper hand in the 19th century and now accepted by nearly all competent critics.

But this modern position must not make us less sensitive to the problem of pseudonymity. Earlier ecclesiastical theology felt it as an attempt to make

<sup>1)</sup> cf. my commentary and Rowley, Journ. of Theol. Studies 1937, p. 426.

<sup>2)</sup> G. R. Driver, in JBL 1926, p. 119; against Schaefer, Iranische Beiträge I (1930), p. 254, cf. Rowley, The Aramaic of the Old Testament (1929), p. 148: Schaefer obviously has overlooked the decisive arguments advanced by the two British scholars, cf. Rowley, Journ. of Theol. Studies 1937, p. 426 on an inconsistency in my commentary, 1st ed.

<sup>3)</sup> op. cit. <sup>4)</sup> Americ. Journ. of Sem. Lang. and Lit. 1933-34, pp. 1ff.; 1935-36, pp. 95ff.; cf. Rosenthal, Die aramaistische Forschung (1939), pp. 24ff.).

<sup>5)</sup> already in ZATW 1927, pp. 123-33.

the book "an imposture"<sup>1</sup>). This problem is more acute here than in the case of other OT books, especially in chs. 7–12. Here the visions themselves, not – as in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms – only later tradition, tell us the name of the author ("I, Daniel..."). These "I, Daniel..."-passages however stand in a framework of a story teller (cf. above, p. 197), the situation accordingly being analogous to that of the speeches of Moses in Deut. But we must take into account that antiquity thought otherwise concerning literary property than our times. A neo-Platonist, *Jamblichus*, ca. 300 praises the neo-Pythagoraeans who published their books, not in their own name, but in that of their teacher, and so renounced their own fame<sup>2</sup>). In the case of later Jewish literature we must understand that the real author has lived so intimately in his imagination with the person whose thoughts he wanted to express, that he used his name *bona fide* instead of his own<sup>3</sup>).

#### The Home of the Author, and the Traditions embodied in Dan.

The date and the situation of the book makes it probable, on internal grounds, to assume that it has been written in its present form in *Palestine*. But the material of the legends, their connection with Eastern diaspora and the courts of Babylon and "Media", proves that the original home of the motley *traditional material* joined together in the descriptions of milieu, e.g. also the popular traditions of "Nebuchadnezzar"<sup>4</sup>), the theory of world ages etc., must have been those parts of the world. But here again the *Greek* words prevent us from going too far back with the stories as they stand now.

Another thing is that the book and its traditions exhibit a rich field for the *investigation of traditions and their life*. Most apocalypses contain much material, handed down from time immemorial, but used by the apocalypsts in their own way. This has often led scholars to become occupied so

<sup>1</sup>) See e.g. the large book of *Pusey*, *Daniel the Prophet* (1864 and many later edd.), the polemic of which was sharply rebuked by *Dean Stanley*. A characteristic quotation from *Pusey* is given in the small commentary by *R. H. Charles* (in the *New-Century Bible*), p. XLIV f.

<sup>2</sup>) *Clemen*, *Paulus I* (1904), p. 8.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 259 f. – *Rowley* (*ZATW* 1932, pp. 266 ff., cf. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1947), p. 36 ff.), thinks that the pseudonymity of Dan. grew out of its genesis, and that it was not consciously intended from the start, but that succeeding writers slavishly copied this feature, as though it were part of the technique of Apocalyptic. The stories, originally circulated separately without any authors' name under the guise of Daniel, not in order to deceive the readers, but in order to reveal his identity with the author of the Daniel stories.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. my commentary, *passim*.



strongly with these things that they lost the sense of proportions and forgot that the task of the interpreter is not only to trace such old remnants, but to understand what the apocalyptists have thought by using them in their new edifice.<sup>1)</sup> But many of these things are of course of importance for the understanding of the aims of the author, and above all of his style and literary devices. For instance it seems not improbable that the “*ritual pattern*” of the *divine ascension festival* with its description of the descensus ad inferos of the divine king and his resurrection and enthronement can be traced behind the vision in ch. 7<sup>2)</sup>, and in the plan of martyr legends like Dan. chs. 3 and 6. Especially ch. 6, the story of Daniel in the lions’ pit, offers a tempting example of this.

It may be assumed that the pit, described in the likeness of a *bôr*, a cistern, used in the psalms as designation of the underworld, goes back to these ideas. The chapter ends in a regular enthronement psalm. The verb *rāgaš* used of the enemies of Daniel (vv. 7, 12, 16) reminds of Ps. 2, 1. The ecclesiastical commendatio animae which uses the two chapters Dan. 3 and 6 with reference to the deliverance of the soul from the realm of death<sup>3)</sup> seems to have been led, unconsciously, by a feeling of the original meaning of the traditions used by these legends.

Among the traditions is perhaps also *the name of the hero* used by the Jewish author to be the bearer of his preaching.<sup>4)</sup> Ez. 14, 14, 20 and 28, 3 presuppose acquaintance with a certain *Daniel*, said to have been very just and wise. It has been thought that this Daniel was one of Ezekiel’s contemporaries. But this is most probably a wrong interpretation of the passages in Ez., naming Daniel between Noah and Job in a way which indicates that the three figures belong to the past, not to the time of Ezekiel. This hero of the past may, in some way or other, be related to the *Danel* of the Ras Shamra texts, described as a man expert in the use of oracles and acting as the protector of widows and orphans<sup>5)</sup>.

### Integrity of the Book. The Change of Language.

Some traces of *later adaptation* (actualisation) in ch. 2, 41 were mentioned above. Similar phenomena are found by critics e.g. in ch. 7. A great addition

<sup>1)</sup>cf. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* VI, p. 233f. Eissfeldt-Festschrift, ed. Fück, 1947, p. 59f., and my book *Messias-Moses redivivus-Menschensohn* (1948), p. 24.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. my commentary, and *Messias-Moses redivivus-Menschensohn*, pp. 72ff.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. my commentary *ad loc.* and my contribution to the Festschrift for Bertholet (1948), where I have attempted a more detailed argument for the assumption.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. Rowley, above, p. 201, n. 3. Noth, in *Vetus Testamentum*, 1951, pp. 251ff.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. Virolleaud, *La légende phénicienne de Danel* (1936).

is the *prayer of penance* in ch. 9<sup>1</sup>). Similar expansions are also the *songs* interpolated in Greek tradition in ch. 3. Evidence of the popularity of the figure of Daniel we also have in the *apocryphal* stories handed down in Greek form<sup>2</sup>).

An apparently insoluble riddle is the peculiar *change of language* in the book. Ch. 1, 1-2, 4a are in *Hebrew*, 2, 4b-7, 28 in *Aramaic*, and 8-12 again in *Hebrew*.

Many hypotheses have been advanced to explain this anormality. Some critics have thought that the beginning and end of the book have been translated into Hebrew from Aramaic to secure the book its standard as a *canonical* writing, others that it is due to an *accident* that the middle part of the book only has been preserved in Aramaic. If Ps. 145, 13 contained a quotation of 3, 33 and 4, 31, we would have to assume that the legends were originally composed in Hebrew. But most probably Ps. 145 does not quote Dan.<sup>3</sup>) I think it most plausible that the legends, being—together with the original parts of ch. 7—an older stratum in the book, have been found in Aramaic by the Maccabaeen author, who himself wrote Hebrew and therefore composed his introduction (ch. 1) and his special property, 8-12, in this language, perhaps influenced by the national upheaval under which he lived (cf. 2 Macc. 7, 8). But it remains a difficulty that the transition into Aramaic takes place in the middle of a sentence, in 2, 4, not at the beginning of the chapter<sup>4</sup>).

The book is in spite of this and other incongruities a *unity*, both in literary and religious respect. Its calculations of the future are a failure<sup>5</sup>). But it is inspired by a genuine faith in God and a living hope<sup>6</sup>).

#### Position of the Book in OT Literature.

While our Bible translations, following the LXX, count Dan. as the fourth of the "Major Prophets", the *Palestinian Canon* places it among the *Hagiographa*. This has been explained on the ground that Daniel had not *munus*, but only *donum propheticum*.<sup>7</sup>).

This distinction seems quite artificial. The book shares the common prophetic faith in God's plan for the world and the imminent realisation of this

<sup>1</sup>) for all this, cf. my commentary. <sup>2</sup>) cf. below, pp. 299ff.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. my commentary, also on the translation-hypotheses of Zimmermann and L. Ginsberg. <sup>4</sup>) cf. Duhm, *Israels Propheten*, 2nd ed. (1922), p. 412; Rowley, *ZATW* 1932, pp. 256ff.; Eissfeldt, p. 581; Pfeiffer, p. 761f. <sup>5</sup>) Baumgartner, *Das Buch Daniel*, p. 40.

<sup>6</sup>) cf. my *Danielbogens Aktualität* (1938).

<sup>7</sup>) cf. Kuenen, *Einleitung II*, p. 482; cf. also Michael Friedländer, *Die jüdische Religion* (1922), p. 94, and the criticism in Bleek, p. 417. — Mt. 24, 15; *Josephus* (C. Ap. I, 40; Ant. X, 267ff., and Audet's list (Journ. of Theol. Stud. 1950, p. 145) appear to take another view than the later Baraita, *Talmud Babl.* 14b-15a (cf. I, p. 28).

plan in history through God's victory over his enemies. And the author also seems to know what prophetic ecstasy is (cf. above). From the prophets he is distinguished by the vast mass of traditional material. We meet here, e.g. in ch. 9, a *scholar*, a man of learning, studying the ancient prophets, but also working on a great amount of material from Oriental – popular and learned – tradition, not only of “historical” character, but also of cosmological sort (the teaching of the world ages in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, in the four period scheme in chs. 7 and 8, in another form in the theory of the “weeks” in ch. 9), all the mythological elements in the visions and e.g. the idea of the tree of the world in ch. 4. Moreover he has a great amount of real historical knowledge, most reliable for the later periods (ch. 11). Features of this kind already begin to appear in the prophetic books of Ezekiel and Zechariah. All this indicates that we have no longer to do with genuine ancient prophecy. Daniel, like most of Jewish Apocalyptic, rather represents the circles of the Sages<sup>1</sup>).

#### The Septuagint Text of Daniel.

Chs. 1–3 and 7–12 in the LXX – setting aside the apocryphal additamenta – in general agree fairly well with the Massoretic text. But chs. 4–6 deviate very much. Here we have a view of the pagan adversaries of Daniel more in accord with the controversies of the Maccabaeic age. The chapters could well be assumed to represent a form of traditions different from the “*Hebraica Veritas*” and perhaps influenced by another line of oral tradition. These deviations have caused the rejection of the so-called LXX-text<sup>2</sup>) and its replacement through the revision of *Theodotion*<sup>3</sup>). The LXX-text of Daniel is therefore only very poorly represented in manuscripts. Until the discovery of the important *Chester-Beatty-Papyri*<sup>4</sup>), giving chs. 3,72–6,18, 7,1–8,27 on 13 leaves, we only knew Daniel through the so-called *Codex Chisianus* from the 11th century A.D., a rendering of the Hexaplaric version of Origen, and through *Paul of Tella*'s Syriac translation of the Hexapla-text.

*Literature*, see the selections in my commentary, 2nd edition.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 172f. and pp. 257ff. – On the literary type of Dan., see *Steinmann*, pp. 27ff.

<sup>2</sup>) Dan. belongs to the parts outside the Law the text of which has been collected from non-canonical Greek-Jewish translations by the Church (cf. vol. I, pp. 80ff.).

<sup>3</sup>) vol. I, p. 90f. – The variants are registered in the ed. of *Kenyon*, pp. Xff.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 80.



The fullest modern commentaries are *Montgomery's* (Intern. Crit. Comm. (1927) and *Charles's* (1929) (different from his small volume in The Century Bible). Very valuable is that of S. R. Driver in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.

Edw. J. Young (1949). Steinmann (1950). – Rowley, The Unity of the Book of Daniel Hebr. Union Coll. Annual, 75th Anniversary Publications 1950–51, pp. 233ff.).

There is an edition of the *Ethiopic* text by Löfgren (Paris 1927).

## EZRA AND NEHEMIAH

The books handed down under these names (of 10 and 13 chapters respectively) are originally a continuation of Chronicles. This is seen from the repetition of the end of Chron. in the beginning of Ezra. Their place before Chron. in the Hebrew Canon is due to the fact that they were accepted before Chron. to supplement the narrative of the Book of Kings<sup>1</sup>).

After the separation from Chron., *Ezra and Neh.* were reckoned as one book, also in the LXX<sup>2</sup>). But at an early date the division has been introduced in the LXX and the Latin translations. Jerome (ca. 400) considers the division a matter of course both among Greek and Latin Christians.

Origen and others use the names *1st and 2nd Esdras* of Ezra–Neh., and the *Vulgate* has the superscriptions *Liber primus Esdrae* and *Liber Nehemiae qui et Esdrae secundus dicitur*. The common editions of the LXX like the best manuscripts comprise both books under the name of Ezra, “2nd Esdras”, and have as “1st Esdras” the apocryphal version of Ezra<sup>3</sup>), which is called “3rd Ezra” by some. This *apocryphal* book is in the *Lucianic* recension<sup>4</sup>) called “2nd Esdras”, while the canonical book here is “1st Esdras”. Later *Latin manuscripts* divide the different books of Ezra in the following way. *1st Ezra*: The Canonical Ezra–Neh. *2nd Ezra*: Chs. 1–2 of the Ezra Apocalypse<sup>5</sup>). *3rd Ezra*: The apocryphal historical book, the source of *Josephus*. *4th Ezra*: Chs. 3–14 of the Ezra Apocalypse. *5th Ezra*: Chs. 15–16 of the Ezra Apocalypse.

The division into two books is not introduced in *Hebrew* texts till the 15th century A.D.<sup>6</sup>). And that the Jews originally counted only one book can be inferred from the counting of the scriptures by *Josephus*<sup>7</sup>) (*Contra Apionem* 1.8), from the *Talmud*, *Baba bathra* 15a, and other ancient lists. An evidence of this is also that the massoretes have no subscription after Ezra 10,44, but only after Neh. 13,31.

<sup>1</sup>) Evidence of the uncertain position of Chron. in the Canon, cf. vol. I, pp. 31 and 34 and 73.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. the editions of *Swete* and *Rahlfs*.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. below, p. 219.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 79f. and 85.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. below, p. 246.

<sup>6</sup>) *Pfeiffer*, p. 813, cf. *Ginsburg*, Introduction pp. 586ff., quoted by *Steuernagel*.

<sup>7</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 26, and *Audet*, *Journ. of Theol. Studies* 1950, pp. 151ff.

The books must be treated as a unity, as the continuation of the *Chronistic Work of History*.

They consist of three parts: 1) *Ezra 1-6*, on the building of the temple after the return in 537-516; 2) *Ezra 7-10*, Ezra's reforming activity in Jerusalem; 3) *Neh. 1-13*, the activity of Nehemiah as a governor of Judaea.

### The Composition.

The table of contents just given must not lead to the impression that the books are without problems with regard to their composition. On the contrary, these books contain some of the most intricate problems of OT Introduction and History. There is a series of contradictions, repetitions, and there also seems to exist greater lacunae. It is obvious that the author or authors utilized earlier "*sources*", in the first place the two *relations concerning Ezra and Nehemiah* ("the memoirs"), the first (*Ezra 7-10 + Neh. 8*) partly, the second (*Neh. 1-7*, parts of *11-12*, and *13*) entirely of autobiographic character. Besides we have the *passages written in Aramaic*, *Ezra 4,7-6,18* and *7,12-16*, the first of which seems to be taken from a history of the restoration of the temple (and the walls?). Further some *government letters* are included in this part of the book, all except *Ezra 1,2-4* in *Aramaic*. Dispersed over the whole work are other *documents in Hebrew*, lists of different kinds, *genealogies*, a document concerning the *duties of the congregation* towards the cult (*Neh. 10*). And the whole seems bound together by editorial hand or hands, to put it cautiously, of the *Chronistic* school. How much of the material belongs to the Chronicler himself, is disputed. There has been a tendency to attribute to him everything, which does not make good sense. But this must be a wrong principle. The Chronicler<sup>1)</sup> is a clever author, and consequently it would seem more appropriate to attribute passages which show confusion and bad order in addition to Chronistic peculiarities, to later Chronistic hands, (a) post-Chronistic redactor(s)<sup>2)</sup>.

We have a strong mixture of different documents in the books of *Ezra-Neh*. The problems are mostly of a *historico-critical* nature. The goal of criticism must be to determine their *date* and their historical *credibility* and to group them in the *right order*. It is clear that the *chronology* has been somewhat confused. This seems especially evident in *Ezra 4,6ff.*, where we have a com-

<sup>1)</sup> cf. below, p. 213.

<sup>2)</sup> This has been especially stressed by S. Granild, *Ezrabogens literære Genesis*, undersøgt med Henblik paa et efterkronistisk Indgreb (1949), who assumes only *one* post-Chronistic redactor.

pilation of documents from different times, from the days of Darius I, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes I (521-424), used to illustrate the difficulties of the returned exiles and their plans of rebuilding the temple *before* this period. Moreover chronology has been reversed, so that events from the days of Xerxes and Artaxerxes I have been placed before the events from the reign of Darius I. This has given rise to the – not very probable – theory of the so-called *Book of Tabeel* (4,6-6,22), named after the person mentioned in 4,6<sup>1)</sup>. The chronological confusion is then explained by the assumption, that Tabeel in his report on an attempt to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem during the reign of Artaxerxes I, presumably by Ezra, began with events from his own time, illustrated by precedents from earlier days.

The redactors seem to have had a tendency to push *Sheshbazzar*, according to ch. 1 the leader of the return in 537, into the background in order to favour *Zerubbabel* and *Jeshua* (ch. 3), placing events which we know from the books of Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 (ca. 520) in the days just after the return. In such and other evident faults lies the justification of theories trying to solve the contradictions and other difficulties of the present text on the assumption that the documents must be placed in an order, different from that now exhibited by the work. Many scholars have – following above all *van Hoonacker*<sup>2)</sup> and *Mowinkel*<sup>3)</sup> – e.g. attempted to prove that *Ezra* did not work under *Artaxerxes I* (ca. 458), but under *Artaxerxes II* (ca. 397). But in recent years a reaction has set in against this theory, and a return to the traditional dates is advocated by several scholars<sup>4)</sup>. In a penetrating article for the *Goldziher Memorial Volume Rowley* sums up the present situation of criticism. The majority still seems to be in favour of dating *Ezra* to the year 397 B.C.

The principal arguments for the reversion of the traditional order are: 1) The word *gāder* in Ezr. 9,9 refers to the work of *Nehemiah* as presupposed by *Ezra*. 2) *The list of high priests* (*Neh.* 12,10-11 and 12,22) seems to indicate that *Ezra* lived under a high priest after the time of *Nehemiah's* contemporary *Eliashib* (either *Johanan* or *Jonathan*). 3) *The memoirs of Nehemiah* do not allude to *Ezra*. 4) *Nehemiah's* measures against the *mixed marriages* cannot be understood, when *Ezra* some years earlier had carried out his severe reformation in this field. 5) *Neh.* 12,26 mentions *Ezra* after *Nehemiah*. 6) *Neh.*

<sup>1)</sup> The theory was advanced by *A. Klostermann*, in *Hauck's Realenzyklopädie für prot. Theol. u. Kirche*, V, pp. 516-19 and was developed by *Schaefer*, *Iranische Beiträge I*, pp. 212-25, cf. *Egon Johannesen*, *Studier over Ezras og Nehemjas Historie* (1946), pp. 164 ff. Against the theory see *Noth*, *Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I*, p. 193; cf. *Granild*, op. cit.

<sup>2)</sup> In *Muséon* 1890, and in *Revue Biblique* 1923, pp. 481 ff. and 1924, pp. 33 ff.

<sup>3)</sup> *Statholderen Nehemia* (1916). *Ezra den skriftlærde* (1916).

<sup>4)</sup> cf. the sober review by *Egon Johannesen*, op. cit., pp. 277 ff.



7,4 describes Jerusalem as thinly populated, while Ezr. 10,1 seems to indicate another state of affairs, presupposing the measures of Nehemiah. 7) Ezr. 8,33 seems to allude to the commission mentioned in Neh. 13,13.

Against the late date of *Ezra* we find int. al. the following arguments. a) *Kugler*<sup>1)</sup> attempted to determine the week-days on which the events in the memoirs of *Ezra* have taken place in the years 458-7 and 398-7 (and 352-1) on an astronomical basis. The late dating would then bring *Ezra* into conflict with the Sabbath-laws. b) The list Neh. 3 - from the time of Neh. - contains names from the caravan of *Ezra*. c) *Ed. Meyer*<sup>2)</sup> thinks that the late date of *Ezra* does not give room for the development of Judaism.

*Egon Johannesen* understood a detailed criticism of the arguments, and concluded that none of them are decisive. Some are directly wrong, and others may be used both ways. But he cautiously defends the data of the traditional order, given by the Chronicler. This author lived so soon after the events recorded that it seems improbable for him to have confused the chronology such as assumed by the advocates of the late date of *Ezra*. Since the texts in Neh. 2,1 and Ezr. 7,1 do not distinguish the kings of the name of Artaxerxes from one another by means of patronymica, surnames and the like, it is strongly in favour of the assumption that they speak of the same king in the two passages. - Concerning the word *gāḏēr* in Ezr. 9,9 it is stressed by some critics that this word is no usual term for a city-wall<sup>3)</sup>.

Special *isagogic problems* arise in connexion with the different documents.

The lists are of very different value. Some seem to be pure constructions, while others are valuable sources of history. But here too the question of dates is very intricate<sup>4)</sup>. One of them (Neh. 12,22) carries us down to the time of the last Persian king. But others are certainly earlier.

This especially is the case with the list *Ezra* 2, also found in *Neh.* 7. Is this list really an account from the days of the first return from Babylon in 537, or has it been compiled shortly before it was used by Nehemiah? The superscription has been expanded, *Ezra* 2,2 being evidently a commentary on v. 1, placing it in a time which should make Zerubabel (ca. 520) and Nehemiah (ca. 440) contemporaries (cf. Neh. 12,47!). Perhaps there also is some expansion at the end of the list (after *Ezra* 2,64)<sup>5)</sup>. The crucial question in my opinion is *Ezra* 2,63, which uses the title *hattiršāṭā*, which need not allude to Nehemiah (cf. *Ges.-Bühl*). The family *Hakkoz* is here excluded from priesthood. Accordingly the list must be earlier than *Ezra* 8,33<sup>6)</sup>. But if we (cf. above) assume the traditional date of *Ezra* (458), it must also be earlier than Nehemiah. Further, the High Priest is not considered vested with full authority. That would point to a date soon after the first return (cf. Zech. 3). On the other hand, v. 63 looks back to these events. That speaks for a date somewhat later. Conclusion: Date ca. 500?

<sup>1)</sup> Von Moses bis Paulus (1922).

<sup>2)</sup> Entstehung des Judentums (1896), p. 90, n. 2.

<sup>3)</sup> see Rowley's article in the Goldziher Memorial Volume (with references).

<sup>4)</sup> cf. *Egon Johannesen* and *Granild*, and below (conc. the date of the Chronistic work), p. 215.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. *Hölscher* quoted in my *Studier over det zadokiske præsteskabs historie* (1931), p. 76.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. *ibid.* p. 77.

The *letters* are hotly disputed. Are they real, "genuine" state documents like the Passover papyrus from Elephantine, or are they fictitious letters, inserted by authors as often in ancient times, to vivify the description of events? Referring to the analyses in the books of *Egon Johannesen* and *Granild* I should feel inclined to assume the "genuineness" of the Aramaic documents of Ezra 4-6 and perhaps also Ezra 7, but not of the Hebrew letter, Ezra 1, which seems to me to be tinged by chronistic hue.<sup>1)</sup>

Among the greater documents the *Memoirs of Nehemiah* are most clear-cut. According to *Mowinckel's* still authoritative work *Statholderen Nehemia* from 1916 it is no autobiography in our sense of the word, but a memorial, like the royal inscriptions of the ancient Oriental kings destined to preserve the memory of the great deeds of the pious governor and of the baseness of his adversaries, in order that the retribution and punishment from God might be distributed justly (cf. the often repeated formula in 5,19; 13,14,22).<sup>2)</sup>

*Granild* has given good arguments for the thesis that Chron. did not contain the *Memoirs of Nehemiah*, but only those of Ezra, but with Neh. 8 adapting and replacing Ezra 9-10.

The *Ezra source* is more problematic. Here too scholars often speak of "memoirs", with reference to the "I" and "We-form" of Ezr. 7-9. The difficulty is however that this "autobiographical" form is dropped in the continuation of these chapters in ch. 10 and in Neh. 8 ff.. The latter passage, *Neh. 8-10*, which certainly does not belong to the memoirs of Nehemiah, stands in some connection (at least partly, for Neh. 10 seems to be a separate document) with the *Ezra source*, either as continuation of Ezr. 8,36<sup>3)</sup>, or of Ezr. 10<sup>4)</sup>. For the former arrangement speak the *dates*, those of Neh. 8-9 lying between Ezr. 7,8 f., 8,31 and Ezr. 10,9 and 16, - But a problem is still the change from the autobiographical form to the narrative in the third person sing. in Ezra 10 and Neh. 8. We cannot give decisive proof of the theory that the Chronicler has changed the original autobiographical form<sup>5)</sup>. S. *Granild*<sup>6)</sup> has advanced several good observations in favour of the theory that Neh. 8-9 is a Chronistic adaptation of Ezr. 9-10 or of the original form of these chapters. - The theory, especially advocated by C. C. *Torrey* and

<sup>1)</sup> On the form of the letters, cf. vol. I., p. 212 f. At the Paris Congress of Orientalists in 1948 *Murad Kamil* reported on the discovery of some Aramaic papyri at Hermopolis West, similar to those of Elephantine (cf. the abstract in the *Actes of the Congress*).

<sup>2)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 247.

<sup>3)</sup> *Schaeder*, *Ezra der Schreiber* (1930). *Egon Johannesen*, op. cit. pp. 261 ff.

<sup>4)</sup> 3 Esdr., *Josephus*, *Mowinckel*, and others.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 247, and below, p. 225.

<sup>6)</sup> op. cit. pp. 128 ff.

G. Hölscher<sup>1</sup>), that the story of Ezra is a purely fictitious legend of the Chroniker, has nowadays been rejected by most scholars. But so much may be true, that the Ezra source is – formally – a sort of “devotional legend”<sup>2</sup>) of Ezra and his work, as seen by a man, living in the same age<sup>3</sup>).

The *history of the restoration of the temple* in the beginning of the book of Ezra (1–6) is perhaps the most problematic of all the passages. Above we have alluded to the so-called theory of the “*Book of Tabeel*” and its rather confused character. It seems to be fragments of a history of the temple and the walls, written originally in Aramaic, but adapted in some parts by Chronistic hand(s) and cast into a Hebrew form (chs. 1 and 3), partly with a confused use of traditions concerning the prophets Haggai and Zechariah.

All things considered the books are so complex and confused that it is very difficult to arrive at certain and sure views concerning them and their different components. A few supplementing words may perhaps be said concerning the *dates* of some of the greater components.

The central complex in Ezr. 1–6, the *Aramaic story* of the temple and the walls, seems to have been composed under Artaxerxes I (the documents in 4,7ff.), but before the arrival of Nehemiah. For the story alludes (4,12) to an attempt to rebuild the city walls prior to that of Nehemiah. This gives us a date between 465 and 444 (Nehemiah’s arrival).

The *memorial work of Nehemiah*, which was incorporated in the work by a post-chronistic redactor (*Granild*) can also be dated with approximate certainty. If the note Neh. 13,6f. is original – which by many scholars is considered uncertain<sup>4</sup>) – then Nehemiah left Palestine after twelve years, and returned from Persia after 432. This must mean that the memorial work was composed after this year. This is affirmed by Neh. 5,14 which mentions a governorship of twelve years before the drawing up of the memorial book. It must have been written *before* 412, in which year Nehemiah was no more governor of Judaea, the *Elephantine letters* having demonstrated that Palestine at this time was governed by a Persian named *Bagohi*.

<sup>1</sup>) Torrey, *The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah* (BeihZATW 1896); *Ezra Studies* (1910). Hölscher in *Kautzsch-Bertholet, Das Alte Testament II* (1923). – Against these theories cf. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (2nd ed. 1946), p. 246f.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 247.

<sup>3</sup>) Such is the idea of Mowinkel, in *Ezra den skriftlærde* (1916). *Granild* has however written some well balanced lines in favour of the authorship of Ezra himself (op. cit. pp. 109 ff.).

<sup>4</sup>) especially Mowinkel, *Statholderen Nehemia*, pp. 59–64, cf. Egon Johannesen pp. 214ff. – Concerning the incorporation of the Nehemiah memorial book, see *Granild*, op. cit. pp. 41 ff.



An exact date of the *Ezra-legend* cannot be given. As noted above, something speaks for the assumption that it has been told by an eye-witness of the work of Ezra.

*Literature:* Hölcher's commentary in Kautzsch-Bertholet's German translation of the OT (1923).

Smend, *Die Listen der Bücher Esra und Nehemiah* (1881). Kisters, *Het herstel van Israël in het persische tijdvak* (1893) (German ed. 1895). Wellhausen, in *Nachr. der Göttinger Gesellsch. d. Wissensch., phil.-hist. Kl.* (1894), pp. 166–186. Review of Meyer's *Entstehung des Judentums*, in *Göttingische gel. Anz.* 1896, pp. 606–608. E. Meyer, *Die Entstehung des Judentums* (1896). Julius Wellhausen and meine Schrift *Die Entstehung des Judentums* (1897). Torrey (cf. above, p. 210). Mowinkel (cf. above, pp. 207). Schaefer, *Iranische Beiträge I* (1930). *Esra der Schreiber* (1930). Exhaustive lists of literature in the works of Egon Johannesen and S. Granild, and in Rowley's article, mentioned above. J. S. Wright, *The Date of Ezra's Coming to Jerusalem* (1947). – There is an edition of the *Ethiopic* text by Pereira. – On the *Traditions conc. Nehemiah*, cf. my article in *Studia Theologica* III, 2 (1949), pp. 158ff.

## THE CHRONICLES

### Name and Contents.

The work of the Chronicler originally was one book, ending in the story of Ezra-Nehemiah. The partition of the *Book of Chronicles* into two books of 29 and 36 chapters is – as in other cases – later.

The title used here originates from Jerome's Prologus Galcatus, where it is proposed to name the book "*Chronicon totius divinae historiae*". The *Hebrew Canon* gives the title as *dibrê hajjamim*, i.e. "(The Book of) the Events of the Days", i.e. "The Annals". The LXX has the title *Paraleipomena*, "The Omitted", viz. the material which has been omitted in Sam. and Kings, or perhaps better: in an earlier Greek translation<sup>1</sup>). In the LXX we have the division into two books, taken over by other versions and in 1448 introduced into a Hebrew manuscript.<sup>2</sup>).

The work (excl. Ezra-Neh.) contains the following parts: 1 *Chron.* 1–9: *The pre-history of the kingdom of Judah* from Adam to Saul, given in the form of lists, genealogies, which however in many places cover times long after David's days. 10–29: *The death of Saul and the history of David.* 2 *Chron.* 1 – 9: *The history of Solomon.* 10–36: *The history of Judah* from the disruption of David's kingdom until Cyrus's permission to the people to return to Palestine.

### Sources of the Work.

The *Chronistic work* is a parallel to the Deuteronomistic–Priestly work in Genesis-Kings (or Deut.–Kings) cf. above<sup>3</sup>), but with a continuation in

<sup>1</sup>) cf. Audet, *Journ. of Theol. St.* 1950, p. 154. – cf. below, p. 220.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. p. 91. — Concerning the place in the Canon, cf. 205. <sup>3</sup>) pp. 19, 72ff.

Ezra-Nehemiah. To a great extent the Chronicler has used the older work as his source. But most of the history of the *Northern kingdom* is omitted. The description of the great personalities of Judah is *idealizing*, omitting features which could detract from their glory. But besides this the Chronicler must have had access to *other material*, for he also brings information not coming from the earlier work, e.g. in 2 Chron. 11,5–12 and 18–23, cf. also 26,6 et. al.

In the style known from the older work the Chronicler also gives reference to other books in which readers may get further information.

He quotes "The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah" (1 Chron. 9,1; 2 Chron. 27,7; 35,27; 36,8), "The Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel" (2 Chron. 16,11; 25,26; 28,26; 32,32), "The Book of the Kings of Israel" (2 Chron. 20,34), "The History (lit. "the Words") of the Kings of Israel" (2 Chron. 33,18 – the English AV is not exact here, giving the title as in 20,34), "The Midrash of the Book of the Kings" (2 Chron. 24,27). In spite of slight differences these titles are so similar that it is generally assumed that it is *one single work* which is quoted under the different names. It can also be inferred from the fact that "Israel" in 2 Chron. 20,34 and 33,18 comprises Judah, corresponding to the passages where both names are given. In the passages quoted we – in spite of the use of the word "Israel" – hear of kings of Judah.

But we also have quotations of other works, named after *prophets*. We hear of *dēbārīm*, *nēbū'îh*, *hāzōth* or *hāzōn*, or of *midrās* (1 Chron. 29,29; 2 Chron. 9,29; 12,15; 20,34; 33,19 – 9,29; 32,32; 13,22). We are told that the prophet so and so has "written" the story (2 Chron. 26,22). As authors are mentioned *Samuel*, *Nathan* and *Gad* (1 Chron. 29,29), *Nathan*, *Ahijah the Shilonite* and *Je'dī* (AV *Iddo*, cf. the *Qerē*) (2 Chron. 9,29), *Shemaiah* and *Iddo* (2 Chron. 12,15), *Iddo* (2 Chron. 13,22), *Jehu* (2 Chron. 20,34), *Isaiah* (2 Chron. 26,22; 32,32), and *Hozaj* (2 Chron. 33,19), the latter perhaps being a textual error for *hōzāw*, cf. AV.

There are however indications that these prophetic sources are not so many as they seem to be. Of the writing of *Jehu* (2 Chron. 29,34) we hear that it has been taken over in the "Book of the Kings of Israel". And in the earlier parts of Chron. (1 Chron. 29,29; 2 Chron. 9,29) the names refer to prophets who have close relations with the kings of whom they are said to have written, and in connection with these kings we have no quotations of "The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah" et sim. But it is on the other hand not possible to reduce the prophetic sources to complete identity with the works concerning the kings, for 33,18–19 can be understood to mean that the "words of the seers" and the "words of the kings" are two different works<sup>1)</sup>.

The main source is however certainly besides Gen.–Kings the work on the kings of Israel and Judah, which in one passage is called "*midrash*". In later

<sup>1)</sup> Eissfeldt, p. 804, cf. Pfeiffer, p. 804. Noth, Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I (1939), pp. 176ff., attempts to prove that most of the quotations are examples of literary mannerism and that the Chronicler only used the Deuteronomistic Work of History setting aside some few passages coming from special sources. This is rightly repudiated by Engnell, Gamla testamentet I, p. 250f.

Judaism this word denotes a learned—edificatory adaptation of the Biblical stories. It is however doubtful if the word is used in this meaning in Chron.<sup>1)</sup> It is pointed out that the word means “study”, “investigation”, and assumed that it here means something like “work”. An examination of the work seems to show that it contained material which did not belong to the most important source of Chron., viz. Gen.—Kings. The “Midrash” accordingly seems to be a rendering of this older work, at the beginning reduced to lists, later in the story abundantly augmented, a collection of manifold informations, partly of historical value. Formally this older work is thought to have been related to Chron. This assumption is necessary to explain the unity of style and language in the Chronistic work<sup>2)</sup>. But it is perhaps too onesided to assume that there was only *one* source besides Gen.—Kings. With Engnell<sup>3)</sup> we also have to remember that *oral traditions* still may have been of importance for the work of the Chronicler. But perhaps it must also be remembered that Chron. do not use the text of Kings, as we have it now, but an earlier recension<sup>3a)</sup>.

#### The Historiography of the Chronicler.

Engnell<sup>4)</sup> rightly underlines the fact that there is a difference between the Chronicler and the earlier work of the Deuteronomist. Perhaps he understates the case of the Deuteronomist, making him chiefly a true compiler of older traditions. The same is the case in his treatment of P. Both authors have their strong convictions, expressed in the framework of Judg. and Kings, and in P in the whole way of rendering the material. The Chronicler goes farther in this direction. The Chronicler — to use the words of Engnell<sup>5)</sup> — “speaks himself and tries to vivify and illuminate the description of the past by letting it be seen in the mirror of the present age, often anachronistically describing the past in the picture of the present”.

The Chronistic historiography is “*dogmatic historiography*”. To a still greater extent than the Deuteronomistic Work the narrative is dominated by religious theory. But while the dogma of cultic centralisation, as far as we can see, did not alter essentially historical facts in the narratives, it can be proved that in Chron. dogmatic ideas have been the cause of unhistorical renderings of the sources. The parallel narratives give plenty of evidence. The Chronicler takes

<sup>1)</sup> Eissfeldt, p. 605. Against the existence of this “midrash” Pfeiffer directs some well-aimed blows and relegates it to the limbo of illusions.

<sup>2)</sup> S. R. Driver, Introduction, p. 525, in the notes. <sup>3)</sup> cf. Engnell, loc. cit.

<sup>3a)</sup> cf. Gerleman, Synoptic Studies in the OT (1948), pp. 34ff.

<sup>4)</sup> op. cit. pp. 253ff. <sup>5)</sup> p. 254.



from Ezechiel the dogma of *individual retribution* and forces it upon his material. If a king lives long and dies happily he cannot – as the *Manasseh* of the Book of Kings – have been an apostate, guilty of many crimes which caused the impossibility of averting Yahweh's wrath from Judah. The Chronicler supposes that a defeat and an exile to Babylon has converted Manasseh, who on his return makes amends for his bad deeds and so lays the foundations of his long rule. But the narrative of the Book of Kings in this case is so obviously true, that it cannot be challenged. On the other hand the Chronicler's story of the insurrection of Manasseh against his liege lord in Nineveh is historically in conflict with everything which we know about his history from Assyrian sources. If Kings was not right, its story, which does not tell of the conversion of the idolatrous king, would be a real fraud. The Chronicler, living several centuries later, did not know better, and his alteration of history was demanded imperatively by his religious outlook. This can be made *bona fide* in an age which had not yet developed a critical historiography in our sense of the word. – Another example of the same is the description of the fate of *Josiah*. The early and unhappy death of this pious king was a shock to the religious dogma of retribution. Therefore it is assumed that Josiah had shown contempt of an oracle brought him by Necho, and this sin caused his defeat at Megiddo and his ensuing death. Those two examples are not the only ones.

Further it is a characteristic feature of the Chronicler that *everything is worked through direct action by God*, and the activity of men is limited to prayers and hymns. There is generally no fighting in the battles arrayed by the Chronicler. The battles are won beforehand by a miracle of God, or the enemies are dispersed, when the choirs of Levites begin their songs before the front, a curious "modernization" of old time war lyrics<sup>1</sup>).

Thirdly, the Chronicler is greatly interested in everything belonging to the *cultus*, especially in the cultic activity of *Levites* and the *Singers*, and in temple music. Every now and then he enlarges upon great descriptions of *temple festivals*. At the murder of queen Athaliah the life guard, which in Kings plays a great part in the *coup*, is replaced by Priests and Levites (2 Chron. 23).

Generally the Books of Chron., therefore, are not considered to be of great *historical value*. Historical value may be attributed to the *material*, taken over from other sources, as e.g. the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah, and perhaps in some of the special material given in Chron. But – on the other hand – for the study of his own times, its culture and its outlook, the books are of course of great value.<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 139f. <sup>2</sup>) cf. Albright, The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat (1950). The archaeological material is of importance for single points of the history, but has not changed anything concerning the general view just stated.

The Chronicler does not only build upon the *deuteronomistic* ideology<sup>1)</sup>, but he knows the whole *Pentateuch* including the cultic theory of P. The part played by the *Levites* in Chron. does not correspond to Deut., but to the situation of P. The descriptions of the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah in Chron. rest on the laws of P (Ex. 12, Num. 18). But Chron. exhibits a development which has passed that of P. Levites and Singers have in Chron. a more important position than in P. The circles behind Chron. have been interested in improving the status of these parts of the clergy<sup>2)</sup>. But *Noth* and *Engnell* are right, when they correct the opinion among critics, that the Levitical interests are the main interests of the Chronicler.<sup>3)</sup> To understand the intentions of the Chronicler we have to keep our eyes upon the position occupied by *David* and the *Temple*, prepared by the king and built by his son. Chron. want to stress the legitimacy of the Davidic kingdom and the Jerusalemite temple as the genuine Holy Place of Yahweh. The Jerusalemite congregation is the legitimate heir to the genuine Israel. According to *Noth* this contains a polemic attitude towards the *Samaritans* and their temple on Mount Gerizzim.<sup>4)</sup> In Chron. the Samaritans are represented by (Northern) Israel. *David* has a position in Chron. nearly parallel to that of Moses.

### The Date.

The dependence upon the entire *Pentateuch* proves that the work of the Chronicler is later than the reception of the Torah in its present form as Canon of the Jewish congregation. And the work itself carries down history till ca. 400, the times of Ezra and Nehemiah. Accordingly we must fix upon the 4th century as the earliest date of its origin. But some of the *lists* embodied in the work seem to be capable of being dated to a later time, provided that the text is sound in 1 Chron. 3,17-24 and Neh. 12,10-11: If these passages rightly count 11 generations from Zerubbabel (ca. 520), and if we take each generation as counting ca. 25 years, and if the passages come from the hand of the Chronicler, and are not later interpolations, then we would arrive at a 250 B. C. as the date of the work. But perhaps only 5 generations are reckoned there, and this will only lead us to some time after 400.<sup>5)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> This side was rightly stressed by *von Rad* in *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes* (1930). <sup>2)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 611f. <sup>3)</sup> *Noth*, op. cit. p. 216, *Engnell*, op. cit. pp. 256ff.

<sup>4)</sup> *Noth* here follows C. C. *Torrey*, *Ezra Studies* (1910), p. 208f., cf. *Engnell*, p. 256, n. 2.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. also above, p. 207, concerning Neh. 12,22, which probably belongs to a post-Chronistic hand (cf. *Granild*). - *Albright*, op. cit. has given plausible arguments for an earlier date; but his identification of the Chronicler with Ezra seems uncertain (cf. pp. 209ff).



Later expansions seem to have augmented the lists in order to bring them up to date. But we do not know for certain, how far down into the later days of Judaism this would carry us. *Hölscher* in his comments on Ezra-Nehemiah<sup>1)</sup> thinks that we may discern *Maccabean adaptations* in some places.

On the other hand Ecclus. 47,2-11 in his description of David reveals dependence upon the Chronistic picture of the great king. And 2 Chron. 2,2-15 has ca. 157 B.C. been used in a Greek form by the Greek-Jewish historian *Eupolemus*<sup>2)</sup>.

*Literature:* *Commentaries* in the usual series and by *Rothstein* in *Kautzsch-Bertholet's* translation of the OT, 4th ed., and to 1 Chron. in the series of *Sellin*. *Curtis and Madsen* in *Intern. Crit. Comm.* 1910.

The works of *Noth* and *Engnell* mentioned above. *Wellhausen*, *Prolegomena*, 6th ed., ch. 6. - Edition of the *Ethiopic text* by *Grébaut*. On the LXX-text: *Gerleman*, *Studies in the Septuagint II*, *Chronicles* (1946); cf. also the article of *Rowley*, mentioned above, p. 207, and the essay of *Snaith*, in *The OT and Modern Study*, ed. by *Rowley* (1951). - *A. Spiro*, *Samaritans, Tobiads, and Judahites in Pseudo-Philo* (1951).

### THE HAGIOGRAPHA AS A RELIGIOUS DOCUMENT

In the Hagiographa we - as in the Canon of the Prophets - meet the "Law" and the "Gospel", the warning and the hope in the work of the Chronicler. The "Law" we also find in a peculiar form in the advice of the Wisdom literature, and hope is preached in the Book of Daniel.

But another point of view must also be underlined. The two older parts of the OT are above all expressions of the "objective" factor, of God's speaking to Israel. In the third part of the Canon we more distinctly hear the *human response*. The manifold moods of the *Psalms*, the sorrow in *Lamentations*, the doubts and the faith in *Job*, the resignation in *Eccles.*, the dreams of revenge in *Esther*, human love in the *Song of Songs*, human faithfulness of *Ruth*, and *Daniel's* fidelity during all temptations, give to this part of the Canon a tone from the human side, from those who receive and accept Revelation. This is also there in the older parts of the Canon, e.g. in the descriptions of the Patriarchs and of Moses, in the expressions of the prophets fighting with their vocation. But it is more marked in the Hagiographa. We find here a stronger hold against docetism in our view of the Bible than before. We meet a living suffering and rejoicing Israel, as the human beings they were. The Word was made flesh<sup>3)</sup>. And this throws light back upon the older

<sup>1)</sup> cf. p. 210.

<sup>2)</sup> *Schürer*, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* III, pp. 474 ff.

<sup>3)</sup> This main idea is very well set forth in the essay *Revelation in the Old Testament* by *Irwin*, in *The Study of the Bible today and tomorrow*. *Irwin* talks of the whole OT. -



parts of the Canon, reminding us that such things as could be repellent e.g. in the conceptions of God has its cause in the men whom He ventures to use as his instruments. The dogmatic historiography of the Chronicler in this connection becomes important. Like Job and the Preacher it is an expression of the authors's meeting with Doubt, just as his jubilant descriptions of cultic festivals are expressions of Faith, and just as the confessions in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel give us a moving impression of the *penitential attitude* of the post exilic congregation.

And this also points forward. The *Apocrypha* are determined by the same moods. And just as the light from the Hagiographa shines back over the Law and the Prophets, so it also colours the double issue of the Old Testament: The Talmud and The New Testament, the Law and the Gospel, and the human limitation, and the hope of the advent of the Messiah.

I only should make one reservation against his description of the men behind *Wisdom Literature* (p. 258). Irwin says that the Sage would have been the most surprised man imaginable if one had accosted him with an ascription of divine inspiration; for brevity's sake I only refer to vol. I, p. 172 f. – But I cannot refrain from adding a reference to Lagrange, *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ*, p. 560, and to the quotations from Philo given in the notes: *De migr. Abr.* 35; *Leg. allegor.* III, 45. *De sacrif. Ab. et C.* 55; *Quis rer. div. her.*, 259f.; *De vit. Mos.* II, 40, all proving the consciousness of something interpreted as divine inspiration of himself and other Sages.

# APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Concerning the connotation of the words *Apocrypha* and *Pseudepigrapha* readers are referred to vol. I<sup>1</sup>). In the present connection the books are treated from the same points of view as the canonical books. They are not found in the Hebrew Canon, but only in collections in other languages. Of one book, Ecclesiasticus, large parts of a Hebrew original have been found, and in other cases such an original must be presupposed. Historically the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha are an extension of the Hagiographa.

*Editions of the texts.* The Greek and Latin texts are found in *Fritzsche*, *Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti* (1871) and in the *editions of the LXX* (*Swete* and *Rahlfs*). The works in other languages are only found in separate editions, which will be mentioned in the different cases.

*Translations:* *Kautzsch*, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des AT* (1900) (the ed. from 1921 is a reprint). *Charles*, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT* (1913) *Riessler*, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel* (1928).

*Important Literature:* A useful survey by *J. Coert Rylaarsdam* in *The Study of the Bible...* ed. by *Willoughby* (1947), pp. 32–51. *Schürer*, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* III, 4th ed. (1909), pp. 188–716. *Bousset*, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 3rd ed. by *Gressmann* (1926 – with revised title *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, as part of *Lietzmann's Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*). *Stählin*, *Die Hellenistisch-Jüdische Literatur* (separate vol. of *Christ, Griechische Literaturgeschichte* II, 1 (6th ed. 1921), pp. 535–658). *G. F. Moore*, *Judaism I* (1927), pp. 125–216; III (1930), pp. 40–60. *Lagrange*, *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ* (1931). *Bonsirven*, *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus Christ* (1935). A great deal of OT Introductions also treat the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. A special handbook is provided by *Oesterley*, *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha* (1935). *Torrey*, *The Apocryphal Literature* (1945)<sup>2</sup>). – *R. Pfeiffer*, *History of New Test. Times*, with an Introduction to the Apocrypha (1949).

On the *Apocalyptic literature*: *Rowley*, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1944, 2nd ed. 1947) gives many sound views and an important bibliography.

<sup>1</sup>) pp. 20ff.

<sup>2</sup>) *Torrey* rejects the term “pseudepigrapha” (cf. *J. Coert Rylaarsdam*, op. cit. p. 44.)

## THE APOCRYPHA

### 3rd ESDRAS.

The book is also called *1st Esdras* or *2nd Esdras*<sup>1</sup>). It is preserved in Greek and in a Latin translation from the Greek, and there also exist other translations, e.g. in *Ethiopic* and *Syriac*<sup>2</sup>). It is considered a variant of the canonical book of Ezra, containing 2 Chron. 35,1-36,21, Ezra 1,1-10,44 and Neh. 7,72-8,13, with a long *insertion* between Ezra 4,24 and 5,1, and two shorter *additamenta* between 2 Chron. 35,19 and 22 (3 Esdras 1,21-22), and before Ezra 2,1 (3 Esdr. 5,1-6). The great insertion in 3 Esdr. 3-4 is a *devotional legend*<sup>3</sup>) of the three boys at the court of king Darius, showing how Zerubbabel got the opportunity of rebuilding the temple.

The book ends (9,55) in the middle of a sentence. This must mean that the book is a fragment<sup>4</sup>). *Josephus* in his *Antiquitates*, book XI, seems to have used 3 Esdr. as his source. 3 Esdr. does not mention Neh., and *Josephus* apparently also treats the story of Nehemiah independently of that of Ezra. It is disputed whether this means that 3 Esdr. did not know the Chronistic work in its present state, but used an earlier recension, not including the story of Nehemiah<sup>5</sup>), or if the compiler of 3 Esdr. altered the canonical edition of the Chronistic work.

*Egon Johannesen*<sup>6</sup>) has submitted the relations between 3 Esdr., the Masoretic text, and the LXX-Esra to a minute examination. His results concerning 3 Esdr. in relation to the MT are<sup>7</sup>) that in most cases the text of 3 Esdr. is of inferior value. On the relations between 3 Esdr. and the LXX-Esra he notes<sup>8</sup>) that LXX - Ezra and 3rd Esdr. in several cases deviate from the Masoretic text in the same erroneous way, and he concludes that the two authors must have known and used one another, but he does not enlarge upon this difficult question. Remembering the views on the Greek translations set

<sup>1</sup>) cf. above, p. 205, and *Oesterley*, *Apocrypha*, p. 133 f.

<sup>2</sup>) *Torrey*, *Ezra-Studies*, p. 64, cf. *Egon Johannesen*, *Studier over Esras og Nehemjas Historie*, p. 22.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 237 ff.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. *Egon Johannesen*, *op cit.*, p. 112 against my doubts in the Danish ed. of the present book.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. above, p. 209.

<sup>6</sup>) *op. cit.* pp. 23-126.

<sup>7</sup>) cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 112 ff. *Granild*, *op. cit.*, pp. 284 ff., thinks that 3rd Es. is later than MT and dependent upon it.

<sup>8</sup>) *op. cit.* p. 125 f.



forth in vol. 1, in combination with *Kahle's* ideas<sup>1)</sup>, of the importance of *oral tradition*,<sup>2)</sup> I should feel inclined to be cautious in assuming a too mechanical theory of "authors" having "used" one another. In different circles of traditionalists the story of Ezra may have assumed different shapes, which may have led to different forms of the last chapters of the Chronistic work. But we cannot avoid mentioning the theory, already advanced by *Grotius*<sup>3)</sup>, that 3 Esdr. is a remnant of the oldest Greek translation of the Chronistic work.

The most important special material in the book is *the legend of chs. 3-4*.

The legend is an adaptation from an older story. This is proved by the explanatory note in 4,13, and in the altered conclusion where the victorious boy gets another reward than that promised in 3,5-7 and 4,42, perhaps also by the curious idea that the victor praises both woman and truth. This – probably "judaizing" – adaptation has been undertaken before the story was introduced in the book of Esdr., for 4,43-46 contradict 2,1-14, where the permission for the restoration of the temple was given already by Cyrus.

The *Date* of the book is generally fixed in the *2nd century B.C.* But *Egon Johannesen* rightly stresses that we have no reliable *terminus ad quem* before the *Antiquitates of Josephus*, compiled ca. 90 A.D. The *text* has been revised several times in order to bring in into accord with "Hebraica (or Aramaica) Veritas"<sup>4)</sup>.

*Text: Tedesche*, A critical edition of I Esdras (1928) (Philosophical dissertation from Yale university) has not been accessible to me.

*Literature: Egon Johannesen* (cf. p. 207. n. 1), and his bibliography, pp. 14-18. – On the Zerubbabel-legend, *Torrey*, *Apoc. Lit.*, § 11. – *Audet*<sup>5)</sup> thinks that the two books of Esdr. rest upon two Aramaic Targums. As Esdr. B represents MT, Esdr. A translates the Targum mentioned by the Canon-list from Jerusalem from ca. 1 Cent. A.D. This Targum was a free translation of the last part of the Chronistic Work. It was translated into Greek in Palestine and later came to Egypt. But it was not accepted, and so a new rendering of Ezra-Neh. was made, i.e. our Esdr. B. At last Chron. was translated (hence the name, cf. above p. 211).

<sup>1)</sup> pp. 80ff. <sup>2)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 103ff.

<sup>3)</sup> quoted by *Eissfeldt*, p. 632; cf. *Engnell*, *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*.

<sup>4)</sup> *Johannesen*, op. cit. p. 114f., after *Hölscher* in *Kautzsch-Bertholet*, p. 196.

<sup>5)</sup> *Journ. of Theol. Studies* 1950, pp. 152ff.

## THE FIRST BOOK OF THE MACCABEES

### Contents.

The book is divided into 16 chapters.

It tells the story of the *persecution of the Jewish religion by king Antiochus IV Epiphanes* and the ensuing insurrection of the Jews against the Syrians. It relates the earlier history of the Maccabaeen dynasty until its culmination in the happy age of *Simon*, and concludes in a short commemoration of his successor *John Hyrcanus*. Accordingly it relates events between 175 to 134 B.C.

The original language is thought to have been *Hebrew*, but we only know the Greek translation.

### Relations to 2 Macc.

The first half of the book is parallel to 2 Macc. *Schlatter* and *Kolbe* tried to prove that the two books rely upon the same source, the historical work of *Jason of Cyrene*. But the books are quite different. It has been said that they are related to one another in the same manner as *Kings* to *Chron.* Stylistically 1 Macc. is of the same kind as ancient Israelite story-telling<sup>1</sup>). It describes the age of *Simon* in terms of Messianic prophecy, thus revealing a strong pro-Maccabaeen tendency, and upon the whole shows more political interest, while the edificatory tendency, interested in often very gross miracles, is patent in 2 Macc.

The question of *historical value* is disputed. Against prevailing views *Niese* tried to vindicate the priority of 2 Macc. But this was corrected by *Wellhausen*, who stressed that neither of them must be treated with uncritical faith or disbelief. The question of historical value must be examined from case to case.

### Date.

The end of the book in good style (cf. *Kings* and *Chron.*) refers to a book relating the works and deeds of *John Hyrcanus*, which cannot have been concluded till after his death (103 B.C.). This would make our book a little later, suggesting a date ca. 100 B. C. The uncertain<sup>2</sup>) assumption that chs. 14-16 are a secondary addition does not alter this, the passage 13,30, mentioning the monument to the dynasty erected by *Simon* in the native town of the family in 141, must presuppose that the writer of the book works in some distance from that year, to which he refers in the phrase that the monument exists "unto this day".

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 246.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 635.

## Tendency.

The book does full justice to its traditional name. Its aim is obviously to glorify the family of the Maccabees (cf. above), seen as the liberators of Judaism. All evil comes from its opponents, not only Antiochus Epiphanes and his Syrians, but also from the apostate Jews trying to assimilate themselves with the gentiles. The book is *anti-Greek*. Already Alexander the Great, by the Book of Daniel styled *melek gibbōr* (11,3), is the beginning of evil.

*Literature:* Niese, Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher (1900). Wellhausen, Ueber den geschichtlichen Wert des zweiten Makkabäerbuches im Verhältnis zum ersten (Nachr. d. Gött. gel. Gesellsch., phil.-hist. Kl. 1905, pp. 117ff.). Kolbe, Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte (1926). Bickermann, Der Gott der Makkabäer (1937), esp. pp. 27-32.- Cf. the lit. to Dan. - On 1-2 Macc. see the commentary by F.-M. Abel (Les Livres des Maccabées (1949)), cf. also his Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à l'invasion Arabe I-II (1952).

## THE SECOND BOOK OF THE MACCABEES

## Contents.

The book has 15 chapters.

It begins with two letters from the Palestinian Jews to those of Egypt concerning the celebration of the Festival of Hanukkah. Then follows a preface mentioning the author's source, the otherwise unknown Jason of Cyrene. Next we hear of Seleucus IV's attempt on the temple treasure in Jerusalem through his treasurer Heliodorus, who is miraculously expelled from the sanctuary (ch. 3-1). Ch. 4 brings a description of the pious high priest Onias and his fight against the Hellenistic brother Jason. Chs. 5-15 bring the parallel to 1 Macc. 1-9, the story of the insurrection of the Maccabees until the victory of Judah over Nicanor in 160 B.C. and the ensuing introduction of the festival day of Nicanor.

The anonymous author of the book is generally called the "*epitomator*", because he has made an excerpt (epitome) from the work of Jason of Cyrene.

## Integrity and Date.

Kolbe attempts to prove that the documents preserved in chs. 1, 1-2, 18 and 11 have been added by a later hand, who erroneously thought that Antiochus IV died before the rededication of the temple in 164 and accordingly removed the record of this event from its original place before ch. 9 to ch. 10, 1-8.

The relations of the book to 1 Macc. have been mentioned above. Bickermann would prove that the documents of ch. 11 are reliable and of importance for the dating of Dan.<sup>2)</sup> The book is written some time after 1 Macc. and probably in Alexandria. Unlike 1 Macc. it was originally written in Greek.

<sup>1)</sup> Subject of one of Raphael's famous frescoes in the stanzas of the Vatican.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. p. 199.



*Literature:* cf. to 1 Macc. Bickermann, Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr. (ZNTW 1933, pp. 233–54). On the literary type “the Festival Letter”, cf. vol. I, p. 213.

## THE THIRD BOOK OF THE MACCABEES

bears its name without justification. It has nothing to do with the Maccabees.

It describes a persecution by *Ptolemy IV Philopator* (221–204) against the Jews in Alexandria, from which they are miraculously saved. Consequently the king is converted and a commemoration festival on the 3rd–9th of July is inaugurated. The Jews get permission to exterminate their apostate fellow-Jews and to inaugurate another commemoration festival in another Egyptian town, Ptolemais.

The book is unhistorical, setting aside some information concerning the battle of *Raphia* in 217, mentioned in the introduction. The king is expelled from the temple in the same manner as *Heliodorus*<sup>1</sup>). The persecution is also the subject of a passage of *Josephus* (*Contra Apionem* 11,53–55), who dates it to the days of *Ptolemy Physkon* (146–117). The book is akin to *Esther* and witnesses to the same anti-Semitic moods in antiquity. The festivals described are probably Egyptian parallels to the *Purim* of the Eastern diaspora.

The book is a Greek original. The date is uncertain, but the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. is terminus ad quem.

*Literature:* Willrich, Der historische Kern des III Makkabäerbuches (Hermes 1904, pp. 244–58). – I. Abrahams, Jew. Quart. Rev. 1896.

On 4 Macc., cf. below, p. 240.

## TOBIT

### Name and textual Transmission.

In the three oldest manuscripts (Sin., B, and A) the first verse brings the title, *Biblos lógōn Tōbeith* (B: *Tōbit*, A: *Tōbith*). This seems to point back to a Hebrew title, *sefer dibrē tōbi*, and indicates that the present book is a Greek translation of a Hebrew or Aramaic original, the first assumption being most probable<sup>2</sup>).

The book is transmitted in two forms, the manuscripts B and A exhibiting a shorter, Sin. a more detailed shape<sup>3</sup>). A third recension is found in some *minusculae*<sup>4</sup>). It is commonly

<sup>1</sup>) cf. 2 Macc., above, p. 222.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. Oesterley, p. 161.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. the notes in Rahlfs's ed. of the LXX, but compare also the analogous situation in the case of the transmission of the Greek Book of Judges, cf. vol. I, p. 83.

<sup>4</sup>) Eissfeldt, p. 641.

assumed that Sin. is an expansion of an older text<sup>1)</sup>, again being the basis of the *Latin* translation, revised by *Jerome* for the *Vulgate*<sup>2)</sup>). *Jerome* has worked rather strongly upon the text, giving it an *ascetic* colour, but he did not take great pains with his revision, and his report that he used a "Chaldaic", i.e. an Aramaic text, is generally not regarded with confidence. But his translation is the basis of later renderings. *Luther* did not use the Greek texts, but e.g. the older Danish translations did.

The name *Tobias* for the book is a result of a confusion of the names of the main persons in the *Vulgate*, where both father and son are called *Tobias*, while the Greek calls the father *Tobit*, the son *Tobias*.

There exist 4 Hebrew renderings and one Aramaic, none of them being original. In the latter we meet the name *Tobi*, which according to *Buhl* is a mechanical taking over of a form in the Latin translation, *Tobis*, perhaps a remodelling of the Greek forms. How the relations of this name are to *Tobias* is uncertain. *Tobias* is a Greek rendering of Hebrew *Tōbijjāh*.<sup>3)</sup>

### Contents.

The book (14 chapters) is one of the most popular books of the Apocrypha, because it was used to illustrate the right Christian matrimony.

It tells the story of the pious *Tobit*, deported in 721 to Nineveh, who was saved from his blindness, which had befallen him by an accident, when he was doing his duty against countrymen, and how his son, the equally pious *Tobias*, saves *Sarah*, the daughter of *Raguel* from Ecbatana, from the demon *Asmodeus*, who kills her husbands in the bridal chamber. On his journey to Rages in Media to get a sum of money which is owed to his father, *Tobias* is protected by the archangel *Raphael*, who instead of *Tobias* goes to Rages to fetch the money, while *Tobias* goes to Ecbatana and through the advice of *Raphael* saves *Sarah* and marries her. Occasioned by the journey of *Tobias*, *Tobit* gives his son good advice in the style of the *Wisdom* teachers (ch. 4). The book contains in the last chapters some allusions to the book of *Jonah* and prophecies (ex eventu) of the destruction of Jerusalem in 587.

### Date and Home of the Book.

The theatre of the book is the *Eastern diaspora*, and here it probably originated, giving a fine picture of the loyalty of the Jews to their countrymen and of their noble family-life.

The dependence upon the Book of *Jonah* proves that it is of later date. 14,5 refers to description of the second temple in Haggai 2 and Ezra 3, but

<sup>1)</sup> *Buhl*, Fortællingerne om Tobias og Judith (1919), pp. 124 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 87 and 92.

<sup>3)</sup> Whether *Tobit* is a foreign name, Hebraized as *Tobias* (*Johs. Müller*, Beitr. z. Erkl. und Kritik des Buches Tobi (1908), p. 10), is uncertain (*Buhl*, op. cit., p. 127).

shows that *terminus ad quem* must be the building of Herod's temple, which began in 20 B. C. 3,6,10,13 does not mention the hope of *resurrection*, although the author had every occasion to do so, if he believed in it. This probably means that the date must be fixed some time *before the time of the Maccabees*. Sometime in the 3rd century is the most probable date<sup>1</sup>).

### The Material of the Book.

Although the book is strongly impregnated by Jewish nomism, it also reveals connections with non-Jewish circles. The demon *Asmodaeus*, the *Aeshma daeva* of the old Magian, pre-Zoroastrian religion<sup>2</sup>), is perhaps the most certain proof which we have of Persian influence upon Judaism.

Formally the book is a sort of "*short story*"<sup>3</sup>) with the motive of "*the grateful dead*"<sup>4</sup>). This fairy tale motive is modified, the hero of the tale being split into two persons, the father and the son, and the angel Raphael has taken the place of the dead. Besides the book is influenced by *wisdom literature* (cf. above), and there are also some hints at the widely known story of *Ahiqar* (14,10 and 1,21-22), who is made a relative of Tobit.

### Integrity.

The book is partly written in the first, partly in the third person<sup>5</sup>). This, and some inconsistencies etc., occasioned presumptions that the book has not been transmitted in its original form<sup>6</sup>). But these hypotheses have not gained ground. In spite of the inconsistencies there appears a well conceived plan in the book, and the inconsistencies may of course be explained as resulting from the different foreign material used by the author. But it is obvious that the book in the course of time has undergone adaptations, as proved by the different forms of the text.

*Literature:* Buhl (cf. above, p. 224). Liljeblad, Die Tobiasgeschichte und andere Märchen mit toten Helfern (1927). Simpson's commentary in *Charles*, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. A good introduction by Dr. M. R. James in *The Book of Tobit and The History of Susanna* (London, the Haymarket Press, 1929).

<sup>1</sup>) Oesterley, p. 169.

<sup>2</sup>) Nyberg, Irans forntida religioner (1937), pp. 212 and 380.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 241, and Pfeiffer, Hist of N. T. Times.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. Simrock, Der gute Gerhard und die dankbaren Toten (1856) and the literature given in Brix and Anker Jensen's Danish edition of *Hans Andersen's fairy tales* (1924), I, p. 395. Baumgartner, in Theol. Zeitschr., Basel 1950, p. 403, n. 4.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. the book of Ezra, above, p. 209. and vol. I, p. 247.

<sup>6</sup>) cf. the review of Oesterley, p. 168.



## JUDITH

## Contents and Historicity.

The book has 16 chapters.

The 6 first give a rather bombastic and quite unhistorical story of a war undertaken by *Holophernes*, the war-leader of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Assyria (sic.), to punish the Western countries for refusing to take part in a campaign against the Median king Arphaxad. During this war Holophernes besieges the city *Bethulia*, or better *Betylua*, and reduces it to capitulation by cutting its water supply. The inhabitants resolve however to wait for five days, in the hope of relief. Then a wealthy widow, *Judith*, promises to save the town. After praying to the Lord she adorns herself as seducingly as possible and goes to the camp of the Assyrians. She arouses the lust of Holophernes, but after a feast, during which he is so overcome by drink that he does not attain his aim, to seduce her, he falls asleep. She then cuts off his head, and carries it back to the town, having secured a line of retreat beforehand by getting permission to bathe in the strongly watched source every night. The death of Holophernes causes despair in the Assyrian army, which is routed by the inhabitants of Betylua. The book concludes by a *psalm* of thanksgiving of Judith, a record of a festival in Jerusalem, and we are told that Judith died at an age of 105 years without having accepted her many wooers, and for a long time nobody tried to attack the Jews.

The first 6 chapters are, artistically, very poor. Not until the beginning of the story of Judith does the author get a hold upon his work; but there he sometimes attains the heights of the better products of ancient Israelite narrative art. The *psalm* in ch. 16 is very well composed.

*Historically* the book is of no value. History is quite confused as often in post-exilic productions. Characteristic is the "carnival of names" (*Buhl*) from all periods of history. The name of *Holophernes*<sup>1)</sup> is Persian, not very appropriate for a leader of the army of Nebuchadnezzar, who – to reach the climax of confusion – is placed in post-exilic days as king of Assyria. That the story contains an historical nucleus concerning the wars of *Artaxerxes III Ochus* against the Western countries is inferred by some critics, based on the names *Holophernes* and *Bagoas* (12, 11). But the latter name is too common to substantiate the argument. The same is the case with *Holophernes*, which is also the name of a Cappadocian prince from the 2nd century B.C. The high priest of the book might be identified with the one mentioned Neh. 12, 26, but *Joakim* is also a common name.

The book is an *historical novel*<sup>2)</sup> of quite phantastic character. We may still mention the quite unstrategical route followed by Holophernes. This picture

<sup>1)</sup> Better text: *Olophernes* or *Orophernes*. We know a Persian general of this name from the time of *Artaxerxes Ochus* (359–38).

<sup>2)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 247, 240, and 265.

has no doubt been created to describe the contrast between the many nations of the world empire and the little Jewish nation which is saved by the almighty hand of God through his faithful ones, even if it may be an unprotected woman.

With the unhistorical character of the introduction of the book also its main part must be dismissed as unhistorical. Of value is the *exact topographical description* of Northern Samaria and the Southern part of the plain of Esdracelon, also giving evidence of the interesting fact that Jews in these parts were connected with Jerusalem, not with Samaria.<sup>1)</sup> But the town of *Bethulia* or *Betylua* cannot be located. *Dalman* has proved<sup>2)</sup> that it is symbolical like *Betomesthaim* (4,6). *Buhl* thinks that *Betylua* is a transcription of Hebrew *bēt ʾēlōh.*<sup>3)</sup> – In spite of the good narrative art the main part is also full of improbabilities, e.g. Judith's nightly bath in a source strongly watched by soldiers, cf. 12,7. We cannot say for certain that her name is symbolical, signifying the Jewish people<sup>4)</sup>. It means "Jewess", but it also occurs as a proper name in Gen. 26,34(P).

The book exhibits strict observance of the Law and is a good example of the way of life of people akin to the *Pharisees*. Besides it is imbued with a strong *nationalistic* spirit, like the Book of Esther. It often exhibits submission to the rule that when the aim is lawful, the means also are. The way in which Judith uses all her sex-appeal to ensnare Holophernes is not very fine<sup>5)</sup>. According to 13,16 she is able to swear not to have sacrificed her honour as a woman. The question has been asked, if she has counted upon this possibility<sup>6)</sup>. At least the author's opinion is that God disposed events so that she was not obliged to make this sacrifice. But he has not realized that already to act so consciously seducing must be considered immoral.

#### Date.

The book is characteristic of *later Judaism*. As terminus ad quem may be taken the reign of *Alexander Jannaeus*, chs. 2–4 supposing that Galilee and the coastal plain (cf. 2,28) are not yet in the hands of the Jews<sup>6)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Alt*, PJB 1935, pp. 108 and 111, n. 2; 1939, p. 71, n. 4. The book of *Stummer*, *Geographie des Buches Judith* (1947), I have not seen. <sup>2)</sup> PJB 1906, p. 30.

<sup>3)</sup> *Tobit* og *Judith*, p. 103; *Torrey*, *Apoc. Lit.*, p. 91 takes it as a pseudonym for Shechem, used in order to avoid the name of the Samaritan town.

<sup>4)</sup> *Buhl*, *op. cit.*, p. 121. <sup>5)</sup> On the question of traditional motives, cf. *Symbolae...* Hrozny dedic. IV, pp. 1f.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. *Reuss's* comments upon 13,16. <sup>7)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 643.

## Transmission.

The book is preserved in *Greek* in the manuscripts B, Sin. and A and in several cursives. Another recension is found in the Greek cursive codex 58, which seems to be the source of the Old Latin and the Syriac translations. A third version, related to 58, is found in the cursives 19 and 108. The Old Latin is by *Cowley*<sup>1)</sup> characterized as "rough, often merely Latinized Hebraistic Greek", and he says that it "some times misunderstands the Greek which it translates". *Jerome* says that he used a "Chaldaic" version<sup>2)</sup>. His version (in the Vulgate) deviates from the LXX (omissions and concerning geographic details). His ascetic inclinations seem to have made him temper the sensuousness in the description of Judith's behaviour, and he adds pious remarks, strengthening the religious tone of the book.

Behind these texts we undoubtedly have a *Hebrew original*. The language clearly witnesses to this fact, often being more clear when a re-translation is attempted. That the story of Judith was very popular among the Jews is seen from the renderings in Hebrew created during the Middle Ages.<sup>3)</sup> It has been connected with the festival of Hanukkah from the time of the Maccabees.

*Literature:* Scholz, *Kommentar über das Buch Judith und über Bel und Drache*, 2nd ed. 1896. Buhl, *Tobit og Judith* (cf. above). Carl Meyer, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Buches Judith* (Biblica 1922, pp. 193-203). J. Lewy, *Enthält Judith I-IV Trümmer einer Chronik zur Geschichte Nebukadnezars und seiner Feldzüge von 597 und 591?* (ZDMG 1927, pp. LII-LIV). — Introduction by James in the edition of the Haymarket Press (1928). H. Cazelles, in *Mélanges Jules Lebreton I* (1951), pp. 125ff. — My article on 8,27 in the Böhl — congratulation number of *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1952.

## THE PRAYER OF MANASSES

Among the "Odes" found in Greek manuscripts after the Book of Psalms<sup>4)</sup> we find, in cod. A as no. 8<sup>5)</sup> a poem called *Proseuchè Manassé*, in the Vulgate, standing after the Apocalypse of the NT, *Oratio Manassae, regis Judae, cum captus teneretur in Babylone*. Formally the poem is a *psalm of lamentation*, a penitential psalm<sup>6)</sup>. The prayer is connected with 2 Chron. 33,12ff., where the Chronicler mentions such a prayer among his sources of the story of Manasseh. The prayer of the LXX is however originally written in Greek, perhaps not until after the beginning of the Christian era. The oldest evidence of its existence is the *Syriac Didaschalia* from the 3rd Century A.D. and its younger adaptation the *Apostolic Constitutions* (II,22). The translation of the Vulgate is not the work of Jerome, but much later.

*Literature:* Oesterley, pp. 294-299. Widengren, in *Religion och Bibel* 1948, pp. 37 ff.

<sup>1)</sup> in *Charles's Apocrypha*.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. above, p. 224, concerning Tobit.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. Buhl, pp. 115ff.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. above, p. 164.

<sup>5)</sup> in the ed. of Rahlfs as no. 12, cf. the Göttingen ed. of the LXX-Psalms, p. 79f.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 154ff. and p. 166.



## THE ADDITIONS TO DANIEL

## Survey.

A) In the LXX and in the translation of *Theodotion* to *Dan.* 3,24 we find a couple of verses, numbered as 3,24–25. It is a prose introduction to two great poems, separated by means of a few prose lines in vv. 46–51. The poems, 3,26–45 and 52–90, are called *The Prayer of Azariah* and *The Song of the Three Men in the Fiery Furnace*. As *Proseuchè Asariou* and *Hýmnos tôn triôn paidôn* they are also preserved in the *Odes* of the LXX-manuscripts. The English translation combines both poems under the inappropriate superscription *The Song of the Three Holy Children*<sup>1</sup>). This latter signification is founded upon the superscription to the second of the two poems in cod. T and the minusc. no. 55. In cod. A it is called *The Hymn of our Fathers*. That the three men of *Dan.* 3 are called *Children* is accounted for by ch. 1 where they are described as quite young persons at their being brought into the Babylonian court school.

B). In LXX after, in *Theod.* before the canonical book, stands *The History of Susanna*, who through the wisdom of the young boy Daniel is saved from a sentence to death for adultery.

C) Following the History of Susanna, in *Theod.* after the canonical book, we find a twofold story of *Bel and the Dragon in Babylon*.

In the LXX this double story has the superscription "From a prophecy of Ambakum, son of Jesus, of the tribe of Levi", the prophet *Habakkuk* playing an important part in the story (cf. p. 151).

## The Song of Azariah and of The Three Men.

Those texts are not – like *The Prayer of Manasses* and the prayers of *Esther* and *Mardocai*<sup>2</sup>) – further developments of the canonical book. They are believed to be texts, added to the book by redactors, originally independent poems. *The Prayer of Azariah* does not at all fit into the context, being a collective psalm of thanksgiving<sup>3</sup>) and in vv. 29–30 containing a positive confession<sup>4</sup>), not at all appropriate here. *The Hymn of the Three Men* is a mixture of hymn and psalm of thanksgiving<sup>5</sup>).

Both poems are translations of a Hebrew original.

*Literature:* Kuhl, *Die drei Männer im Feuer* (Beih. ZATW 1936).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *Osterley*, p. 272.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. below, p. 231.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 153f.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 153.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 162.

## Susanna.

The story of the virtuous Susanna, a favourite theme of painters and sculptors and subject of a merry poem of the Swedish 18th century poet *Bellmann*, contains two internationally well-known *motifs*, of the woman falsely accused, and of the young, wise judge<sup>1</sup>). The latter element brings in a new feature into the picture of the hero, painted by the canonical book. But it certainly also rests upon tradition. For Dan'el was according to Ez. 14, 14, 20 and 28, 3 a man of wisdom, and his name would also be understood in the direction indicated by the story of Susanna. In this connection we may also recall the *Ugaritic* description of Dan'el, the protector of widows and orphans<sup>2</sup>). Here it is a royal feature in the description of the hero.

A couple of Greek puns in vv. 54–55 and 58–59 are quoted as proof of the assumption that the original language of the story was Greek. Already *Origen* sought in vain for Semitic originals of the puns<sup>3</sup>). The possibility that the puns have been made by the translator must be counted upon, but nevertheless seems more remote<sup>4</sup>).

The story is transmitted in *two forms* in Greek, a longer one in *Theod.* and a shorter in the LXX. Their interrelations are not quite perspicuous, but may ultimately be explained on the assumption of different oral traditions, or on the different forms of Greek translations<sup>5</sup>).

*Literature:* Baumgartner, *Susanna, die Geschichte einer Legende* (Arch. für Religionswissenschaft 1926, pp. 259–80; 1929, pp. 187–88). Scholz, *Esther und Susanna* (1892). Brüll, *Jahrbücher für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur* 1877, pp. 1ff.

## Bel and the Dragon.

This tale is one of the Jewish scoffings at image worship, known from Deutero-Isaiah, perhaps ultimately resting upon the motive from the ideology of the Harvest Festival, the comparison of the gods<sup>6</sup>). The detective-trick of Daniel aiming at exposing the priests looks like a rather common fairy-tale motive. It is assumed that the story of the dragon preserves a Babylonian motif and a piece of a Habakkuk-legend. The motif is partly the same as that of Dan. 6.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. the familiar allusions in "The Merchant of Venice".

<sup>2</sup>) I D, 19–25; II D, 4–8, cf. *Virolleaud*, *La légende Phénicienne de Danel* (1936), pp. 111f.

<sup>3</sup>) *Steuernagel*, p. 788.

<sup>4</sup>) cf. *Oesterley*, p. 285.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 80ff.

<sup>6</sup>) *Mowinkel*, *Psalmstudien* II, p. 52.

An *Aramaic* version from the Middle Ages has probably been derived from Theod., not the Semitic original<sup>1)</sup>. We do not know if a Semitic original has existed.

*Literature:* Scholz: Judith und Bel und Drache, 2nd ed. (1896). Brill, Jahrbücher für jüdische Gesch. u. Lit. 1887, p. 22f.

## THE ADDITIONS TO ESTHER

As mentioned above<sup>2)</sup> the LXX preserves some expansions of the text of the Book of Esther. *Jerome* removed them from the text of his translation, following the Hebrew text, and placed them as chs. 11–16 behind the book. *Luther* cut them completely out of the book and placed them as 7 chapters among the Apocrypha.

The additions consist of three kinds. The *prayers* aim at reinforcing the religious tone of the book. The *royal documents* will vivify the narrative and make it more credible. The rest, the story of the dream of Mardocai and of the detection of the conspiracy against the king have only an entertaining scope.

It cannot be decided, whether the supplements were originally written in a Semitic dialect. Concerning their *date* it can be maintained that they are not quite late. As conclusion of the book we find a note referring to a king Ptolemy and a queen Cleopatra. We may either think of Ptolemy VIII or Ptolemy XIV. In the first case we are led to the year 114, in the second to 48 B. C. – This is inferred from the mentioning of a Cleopatra. The supplements being parts of the Greek text must have existed either before 114 or before 48. *Josephus* has used them in his Antiquities book XI.

Scholz, Commentar über das Buch Esther mit seinen Zusätzen und über Susanna (1892). Paton's Commentary on Esther. Jacob, Das Buch Esther bei den LXX, ZATW 1910, pp. 241ff.

## THE BOOK OF BARUCH

### Contents.

In the LXX the book is placed after Jer. and before Lam., in the *Vulgate*, as *Prophetia Baruch*, after Lam, and in *Luther's* translation among the Apocrypha. It pretends to have been written in Babylon by the friend of Jeremiah, Baruch the scribe, after the deportation in 597.

<sup>1)</sup> *Steuernagel*, p. 788.

<sup>2)</sup> p. 194.



Together with money to defray the expenses of sacrifices for king Nebuchanezzar and for the deported Jews it is sent to Jerusalem to be read at the festivals (1,1-4). The corpus of the book consists of a) national penitential psalm<sup>1)</sup> (1,14-3,8); b) a didactic poem of a type similar to Ps. 78 and 106, 50 etc.<sup>2)</sup> (3,9-4,4), exhorting Israel to conversion and return to the Law; c) a series of lamentations and consolations to Israel (4,5-5,9), of the same type as the preceding section.

#### Date.

The prayer of penitence (1,15-3,8) recalls the corresponding prayer in Dan. 9,4-19 and is perhaps an extended recension of this poem. It is therefore also probable that it is a translation of a Hebrew original. This involves that it cannot be earlier than the *first century B.C.* From 2,21-26 it has been inferred that the poet knew the disasters of 70 A.D. On the other hand, 2,17 would then certainly have alluded to the belief in resurrection, which would lead to the assumption of a somewhat earlier date.

The poems in 3,9-5,9, perhaps also originally written in Hebrew, can be dated by the almost literal dependence upon the Psalm of Solomon 11,2-7. The Psalms of Solomon date from the first century B.C., and accordingly these passages of Baruch should be a little later, from the time of the beginning of the Christian era.

The introduction which does not agree with our certain historical knowledge of the later days of Baruch (Jer. 43,6) is a typical example of unhistoric theories of later Judaism.

Baruch has been a popular figure among the Jews. Apocalyptic writings are also ascribed to him<sup>3)</sup>.

The book is treated in the standard collections of *Kautzsch* and *Charles. Thackeray*, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, Lect. III. - *Ringgren*, *Word and Wisdom* (1947) assumes that the book was a *liturgy* for a day of repentance.

#### THE EPISTLE OF JEREMIAH

In the *Vulgate* this work is the 6th chapter of Baruch, cf. also the translation of *Luther*, while the *LXX* has it as an independent work after Jer., Bar. and the Lamentations. It must of course be distinguished from the letter from Jeremiah to the deported, of which we hear important passages in Jer. 29. The apocryphal Epistle is a warning against the *cult of images* in the usual apologetic style, known from Deutero-Isaiah. The religious forms against

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 154ff. and 166.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 160.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. below, pp. 248 f.

which the author directs his polemic (processions, cultic prostitution) are generally taken as evidence of the Babylonian home of the author. But this is not conclusive, such customs being common all over the Near East.

The language seems to indicate that the letter is translated from Hebrew. 2 Macc. 2,2 alludes to warnings of Jeremiah against images of silver and gold in words perhaps dependent upon the Epistle of Jer. This would involve a date as late as the *first half of the first century B.C.*, perhaps a little earlier.

*Literature:* cf. to Baruch. Further: Naumann, Untersuchungen über den apokryphen Jeremiasbrief, BeihZATW 1913. Thackeray, Some Aspects of the Greek Old Testament (1927), pp. 53–64.

## THE BOOK OF SIRACH

The title of the book is in the LXX *Sophía Iesoû huioû Seirách*, The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, placing it in the circle of *Wisdom literature*. Formally it is a large parallel to Prov. and very important for our understanding of later Wisdom literature.

Concerning its origin we are exceptionally well informed<sup>1</sup>). In a subscription in ch. 50 we find the *name of the author*, *Jesus, son of Eleazar, son of Sirach*. The psalm of thanksgiving in ch. 51 has both super- and subscription, giving *Jesus, son of Sirach* as the composer. The work of this man was according to the prologue to the Greek version originally written in Hebrew and translated into Greek by his grandson. The latter tells us that he arrived in Egypt "in the 38th year of king Euergetes". The king thus mentioned must be *Ptolemy Physcon VII Euergetes* (170–164 and 145–117 B.C.), and his 38th year must be 132 B.C. Towards the end of his reign the translation was finished. This must involve that the grandfather flourished ca. 190 B.C., in Jerusalem. He gives an enthusiastic description of the high priest *Simon*, obviously his contemporary (ch. 50). This high priest must be *Simon II*, mentioned by *Josephus* in his *Antiquities* XII, 223–225, the father of the last legitimate high priest *Onias*, deposed by Antiochus Epiphanes in 173.

In the *Vulgate* the book is called *Ecclesiasticus*, generally abbreviated "*Ecclus*". This name first occurs in the writings of *Cyprian*<sup>2</sup>). It owes its origin to the fact that the apocryphal writings sometimes in the Church were called *libri ecclesiastici*<sup>3</sup>), and the book of Sirach accordingly is mentioned as *the liber ecclesiasticus*.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 112f. – Rabbinic material, cf. *Liebermann*, Greek in Jewish Palestine, p. 71, n. 29.

<sup>2</sup>) *Kautzsch's* translation, p. 233.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 40f.

In Hebrew the book has been called *mēšālīm*, cf. Prov. This is inferred from the testimony of Jerome saying that he has known its Hebrew form under the superscription *Parabolae*<sup>1</sup>). This name is also used by the rabbis<sup>2</sup>).

The Greek title is often shortened to *sophía S(e)irách*. The original name of the author (cf. 50,27) seems to have been *Jesus, son of Eleazar, son of Sirach*, where *Ben Sira* probably is a family name<sup>3</sup>).

The Hebrew text was still known to Jerome. Later it was lost, but some extensive fragments have been recovered in our times. We now possess 5 Hebrew manuscripts with about two thirds of the text, chs. 3–16 and 40–51 nearly complete, most of 30–39, and small fragments of the rest.

The book is of importance also for the history of the Canon, especially through the *dates* in the Prologue to the Greek text<sup>4</sup>), 'and for the Special Introduction through its enumeration of Israel's great men in 44,1–49,16. As a whole it is a testimony of the influence of legalistic piety on Wisdom literature. *Ben Sira* is the first scribe (*Baumgartner*).

*Literature: Editions of the Hebrew text: Strack* (1903). *Peters* (1902–1903). *Smend*, (1906). *Marcus*, The newly discovered original Hebrew of Ben Sira (1931). The first fragments were published by *Schechter*, *Cowley*, *Neubauer* and others (cf. *Oesterley*, p. 254, *Kahle*, *Schweich Lectures* 1941, pp. 6–11).

*Mosbech*, Prolegomena til en ny Prøveoversættelse af Siraks Bog (1937).

*Commentaries* in the standard editions. Further: *Smend* (1906). *Smend* has also published an important Griechisch-syrisch-hebräischer Index zur Weisheit des Jesus Sirach (1907). *Baumgartner*, Die literarischen Gattungen in der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, ZATW 1914, pp. 161–98. *De Bruyne*, Le prologue, le titre et la finale de l'Ecclésiastique, ZATW 1929, pp. 257–63. *Kuhn*, Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Jesus Sirach I, ZATW 1929, pp. 289–96; II, ZATW 1930, pp. 100–21. *Buhl*, in (Dansk) Teologisk Tidsskrift 1899–1900.

General literature in Wisdom writings. *Baumgartner*, The OT and Modern Study, p. 227.

## THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON

(Sapientia Salomonis).

The 19 chapters of the book are grouped into three parts.

1–5: a poetical description of the pious and the godless people. 6–9: a song of praise on Wisdom, introduced by an admonition to seek it and a prayer to attain it. 10–19: a description of the miracles of Wisdom, mostly in prose. Wisdom has revealed itself in

<sup>1</sup>) cf. his Praefatio in libros Salomonis.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Kautzsch's* translation, loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup>) Conc. the relations between Hebrew *sira*<sup>1</sup> and Greek *Sirach*, cf. similar forms in Lk. 3,26 and Act. 1,19, Cod. B. The *ch* serves to underline the indeclinability of the word (cf. *Ryssel* in *Kautzsch*, p. 234.)

<sup>4</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 25ff.



the history of Israel from the Creation to the Immigration into Palestine. In this part 13–15 contain a warning against idolatry.

Like other OT Wisdom books this work is ascribed to Solomon. In Greek uncials its title is *Sophia Salomōnos*. The text of the *Vulgate* is no work of *Jerome*, but represents the *Old Latin* version<sup>1)</sup>. Here it is called *Liber Sapientiae*. The full title is known by *Jerome* in his *Praefatio* in *Libros Salomonis* (*Sapientia Salomonis*). But regarding it as a “pseudepigraphon”, he<sup>2)</sup> probably omitted the name in the *Vulgate*. He mentions that some people assumed *Philo* to be the author.

*Oesterley*<sup>3)</sup> rightly says that it would be waste of time to defend the *Solomonic authenticity*. Nor is the theory of *Philonic* authorship probable. The book is obviously later than *Eccles.* and *Ecclus*<sup>4)</sup>. Still more than the latter it shows a clear development away from the form of the sentence<sup>5)</sup>. There are definite traces of *Greek stylistic influence*<sup>6)</sup>. In 6,17–20 we find an example of the so-called *sullogismōs sorētes*, cf. *Rom.* 5,3–5, and especially in the later parts of the book we find the bombastic–pathetic style, characteristic of Hellenistic times. The *contents* corroborate this view. It shows a Jewish nucleus, supplemented with Hellenistic features which sometimes also have affected the nucleus. 2,22, 8,4 seem to imitate mystery–language. 8,7 enumerates the Greek *cardinal virtues*. 8,20 underlines the theory of the *pre-existence of the soul*, which – seen in connexion with 9,15–means that the body is a burden to the soul: This is a real transition to a Greek view of life, antagonistic to Old Testament views<sup>7)</sup>: The pessimistic dualism of the dying Greek world is beginning to transform Judaism too. In this connection it is characteristic that the author under certain circumstances can regard *childlessness* as better than great posterity.

Accordingly the book is a production of the *age of Philo*. It has been assumed that *Paul* has quoted it *Rom.* 9,19–23, cf. *Wisd.* 11,22; *Rom.* 9,22, cf. *Wisd.* 12,12 – et al. – But there are also marked differences between e.g. its ideas of the *logos*, its psychology, and its allegories (which are hardly allegories) and *Philo*<sup>8)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 86f.

<sup>2)</sup> *Oesterley*, p. 196.

<sup>3)</sup> p. 201.

<sup>4)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 656.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 176f.

<sup>6)</sup> cf. *Jerome*: Ipse stylus Graecam eloquentiam redolet.

<sup>7)</sup> *Eissfeldt*, p. 657.

<sup>8)</sup> cf. *Oesterley*, pp. 201ff.

The *unity of the book* is also disputed. It has been maintained that there are inconsistencies in its different parts which lead to the assumption of different authors. But here no unanimous opinion has been attained.

Formally and materially the book seems to be *later than Eccles.* A more exact date has been assumed based on 14,16–17, which seem to speak of the cult of a ruler who is not present. This has been taken as allusions to the *Ptolemies*, who after 282 B.C. claimed divinity. Others stress the fact that the verses speak of an *absent* ruler and think of a combination with the claims of *Caligula* ca. 40 A.D.<sup>1)</sup>

The author aims at *winning back apostates*. There are many passages which are thought to be polemic against *Eccles.*, especially in the first part of the book.<sup>2)</sup>

The Greek form of the book is the strongest argument against the assumption of a Semitic original. The *Semitisms* are thought to be too few to bear a theory of this kind.<sup>3)</sup>

The text is preserved in the mss. Sin. BAV and some minusculi, of which 248 is important as a *Lucianic* text<sup>4)</sup>. The *Old Latin* has been preserved in the *Vulgate*<sup>5)</sup>.

*Commentary:* *Fichtner* (1938, in *Eissfeldt's Handbuch*); here further literature. Id.: *Der AT-Text der Sapientia Salomonis*, ZATW 1939, pp. 155ff. *Baumgartner* (cf. p. 234); on the Religion of the book, see *E. Bevan*, in *The Legacy of Israel*, pp. 63f.

## THE PSEUDEPIGRAPA<sup>6)</sup>

### THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS

This piece of literature which is so important for the understanding of the history of the LXX<sup>7)</sup> claims to be an account from *Aristeas* to his brother *Philocrates*, written under *Ptolemy II Philadelphus* (285–246).

The writer has on the command of the Alexandrian librarian *Demetrius from Phaleron* prompted by the king undertaken a journey to Jerusalem to acquire a copy of the Jewish Law for the library of Alexandria and to find men to translate it into Greek. The 72

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Oesterley*, pp. 207ff. But see the arguments against this advanced in *Fichtner's* commentary, p. 54.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. *Oesterley*, p. 216, but also the limitations underlined by *Fichtner*, p. 7f.

<sup>3)</sup> *Oesterley*, p. 211.

<sup>4)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 79f. and 85.

<sup>5)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 92, and 87.

<sup>6)</sup> concerning the notion of pseudepigrapha, cf. vol. I, p. 21 and 41. – *Torrey*, *Apoc. Lit.*, rejects the term *Pseudepigrapha* and places these writings under the heading *Apocrypha*.

<sup>7)</sup> cf. vol. I, pp. 75 and 81.

translators after 72 days present a clear translation which is authorized by the Alexandrian Jewish congregation. To this story are appended several ornamental passages, e.g. a description of Jerusalem and some conversations between the king and the Jewish scholars on ethical and religious questions, and some apologetical comparisons between Greek and Jewish Philosophy. The conversations resemble Greek *deipnosophistic* talk.

On philological grounds the letter can be dated with certainty to the period between 145 and 100 B. C. A *terminus ad quem* is given by § 107 which seems to have been written before the union of Judaea and Idumaea in 127 B. C.

Its aim is to make propaganda for the translation of the Pentateuch, now after the 72 translators called the Septuagint.

*Editions:* Wendland, *Aristeae Epistola* (1900). Here are also given the other ancient texts in which the legend of the origin of the LXX is told.

*Literature:* Herrmann und Baumgärtel, *Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta* (1923). Willrich, *Urkundenfälschung in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur* (1924), pp. 86–91. Further works in vol. I, cf. p. 236, n. 7. Baumgartner, *The OT and Modern Study*, p. 229.

## THE BOOK OF JUBILEES

The Book of Jubilees, preserved in *Ethiopic* and *Latin* texts, derives its name from the arrangement of historical events used by the author, dividing history in "Jubilee years" (cf. Lev. 25, 10ff.), again divided into "weeks of years" (cf. Dan. 9). It is also called "*The little Genesis*"<sup>2</sup>). The latter title refers to its *contents*.

The book is a parallel to Genesis + Ex. 1–12. The story is imparted to Moses by an angel on Mount Sinai. There are some deviations from the chronology of Gen., Gen. 38 e.g. placed between Gen. 41 and 42. The material of Gen. is given in haggadic and halachic expanded form, embellished by new, often fantastic features and with new moral precepts.

The book is an expression of *Pharisaic* ideas. From 31, 13–20 is inferred that the author belongs to the party of the *Hasmonaeans*, represented by Levi. Accordingly the book must be earlier than the later years of John Hyrcanus, who broke with the Pharisees towards the end of his reign, 103 B. C. 4, 17–19 uses parts of the Book of *Enoch*. The Book of Jubilees, on the other hand, is used by the author of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

It is generally assumed that the book contains material from times before ca. 120, e.g. in geographical information given concerning Ex. 12. The story of the Fall of the Angels (5, 1–14 cf. En. 6–11) does not only use Gen. 6, 1–4, but also other mythological material. It is supposed to have been written in Hebrew.

<sup>1</sup>) Baumgartner, in *The OT and Modern Study*, p. 229.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. the survey of titles in Charles's ed. of the Apocrypha.



*Editions:* Dillmann, *Liber Jubilaeorum aethiopice* (1859). *Charles*, The Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees (1895). The *Latin* text (only about one third of the text is preserved) in *Ceriani*: *Monumenta Sacra et Profana* I, 1 (1861). *Rönsch*, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis* (1874).

*Skat Hoffmeyer*, *Den apokryfe og pseudepigræfe Litteraturs Stilling til Partidannelserne i den palæstinensiske Senjødedom* (1918), pp. 165 ff. *Rowley*, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1944), pp. 58 ff., and 81 ff. (2nd ed. pp. 60 ff. and 84 ff.), against attempts of *Albright* and *Zeitlin* to date the book earlier.

### MARTYRIUM ET ASCENSIO ISAIÆ

The book which is preserved in Ethiopic and Latin, and in Old Slavonic, is in reality a collection of minor writings on Isaiah. Only the Ethiopic text is complete.

1-5 give the description of Isaiah's martyrdom, 3,13-4,18, now part of the first part, is a fragment of a vision, and 6-11 is the book on his ascension to heaven.

1,1-2a, 6b-13a; 2,1-3,12 + 5,1b-14 presuppose a Hebrew original. Here we have the well-known legend of Manasseh's persecution of the prophets (2 Kings 21,1-18), during which Isaiah is said to have been killed by means of a saw (cf. the allusion Hebr. 11,37). This legend is at least older than *Origen* and probably than the Epistle to the Hebrews. The type, the martyr legend<sup>1)</sup>, is in Israel known e.g. in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. and 2 Macc.). It is supposed that the motif of the death by a saw is an Iranian legend motif or perhaps originates from an Adonis myth.

The fragment 3,13-4,18 presupposes the preaching of *Jesus*, and probably dates from ca. 100 A.D.

The Ascensio, 6-11, also a fragment of a vision of Isaiah's journey through the seven heavens, presupposes the Gospel story, and perhaps originated in the 2nd century A.D.

The three parts have, perhaps in the 3-5th centuries, been joined together by a Christian editor, who has expanded ch. 1 and also made other additions. It has been supposed that the joining together of the fragments took place in two successive periods.

*Editions:* Dillmann, *Ascensio Isaiae aethiopice et latine* (1877). *Charles*, The Ascension of Isaiah translated from the Ethiopic Version, which together with the new Greek Fragment, the Latin Versions, and the Latin translation of the Slavonic, is here published in full (1900).

*Commentaries* in the translations of *Charles* and *Kautzsch*, and in *Hennecke*, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (1924), pp. 303-14. *Galling*, *Jesaja-Adonis* (OLZ 1930, cols. 98-102). *Rowley*, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1944) pp. 103 ff. (2nd ed. pp. 108 ff.).

<sup>1)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 238. - Rabbinic parallels, see p. 103, n. 3.

## THE PSALMS OF SOLOMON

Until the 17th century we only had hearsay evidence of a book of this name. Now it is known in 8 Greek manuscripts and in a translation from the Greek into Syriac, the latter combined with another collection of poems, the so-called *Odes of Solomon*. The original text certainly was Hebrew.

The collection consists of 18 poems in the style of the canonical psalms. Even the enigmatic, musical or cultic superscriptions and additions are represented (8,1; 17,31; 18,10). The late date of the poems is thought to be reflected in the very strong mixture of types<sup>1</sup>). They are much more reflective than the canonical psalms.

While many of the poems are of the usual sort, not reflecting definite signs of a certain age, a few of them give hints of the circumstances under which they were conceived, and so allow us to form a theory of their date. Ps. 8 e.g. is interpreted as alluding to the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey and the deposition of the Maccabaeen dynasty in 63 B.C. Also Ps. 2 is thought to be connected with the latter event, but more than Ps. 8 it seems to understand that the yoke of the Romans may be heavy, and it seems to regard the death of Pompey (48 B.C.) with satisfaction. The "Foreigner" mentioned in 17,7 is also interpreted by many as an allusion to Pompey, while others, stressing the fact that the rule of this "Foreigner" seems to be of longer duration, think that he must *Herod the Great* (40/37 B.C. – 4 B.C.). This would mean that this Psalm must be later than 37 B.C., while the two others may be placed between 63 and ca. 30 B.C. Such dates can only be applied to the rest of the collection with some reserve. We have to take into account that there may be works of several poets in the collection.

The circles from which the poems have originated cannot be determined with certainty. It has been thought that they reflect the antagonism between the *Pharisees* and the *Sadducees*, but they cannot be considered definitely Pharisaic. The dogmas of the Pharisees of resurrection and the free will of man are certainly expressed, but not polemically (cf. 3,12; 13,11; 14,9–10; 9,4), and this robs the argument of its validity as evidence of the theory that the poems reflect the contrast of the two parties. And the strong *Messianic hope*, attached to the dynasty of *David* (17–18) is no special Pharisaic feature. Ps. 4 has e.g. been understood as directed against a Pharisaic hypocrite<sup>2</sup>). This

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 162. But against the argument referred to above in the text we also have to take into consideration the remarks against the evolutionistic theory of Gunkel, cf. vol. I, p. 111.

<sup>2</sup>) Lagrange, *Le Judaïsme av. Jésus-Christ*, p. 160, cf. already Skat Hoffmeyer, *op. cit.* p. 122.

instance warns against a too rigoristic interpretation of details on the basis of the contrast between the two Jewish parties<sup>1</sup>).

The title of the collection has nothing to do with the origin of the poems, and they do not – as Wisd. 6–9 – claim to be Solomonic. It has of course been added to the collection on the basis of 1 Kings 5, 12.

*Editions* in Fritzsche and the LXX-edd., and v. Gebhardt in *Texte und Untersuchungen* 13,2 (1895). The Syriac text: Harris and Mingana, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon I–II* (1916–1920) – *Retranslation into Hebrew*: Frankenberg, *Die Datierung der Psalmen Salomos* (BeihZATW 1896). Kuhn, *Die älteste Textgestalt der Psalmen Salomos* (1937). Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1944), pp. 68 ff. (2nd ed. pp. 71 ff.).

*Commentaries* in Kautzsch and Charles. Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadduzäer* (1874). Ed. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums II* (1921), pp. 315–19. Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche I* (1932), pp. 12–16. Lindblom (cf. n. 1). Skat Hoffmeyer, op. cit. pp. 112, 123 and 206–208.

*The Odes of Solomon*, known in old Canon-lists and in a quotation by Lactantius (Instit. IV, 12) and in fragments in the Coptic *Pistis Sophia*, were rediscovered by Rendel Harris in 1909 in a 400-year old manuscript. Another ms. was found by F. C. Burkitt. The Syriac text is not complete and has to be supplied from the Coptic, edited completely by Carl Schmidt in *Optica II* (1925). The Odes have been edited in Coptic and Syriac by Walter Bauer in *Lietzmann's Kleine Texte* (1933), with a good German translation. Translation by Gressmann in *Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 2nd ed. (1924), pp. 437 ff. The Odes are probably a Gnostic collection from the 2nd century A.D. Cf. also G. Kittel, *Die Oden Salomos* (1914), and Gunkel's article in the 2nd ed. of the RGG. Buhl, in (Dansk) *Teologisk Tidsskrift* 1910–11.

## THE FOURTH BOOK OF THE MACCABEES

The title must not seduce us to believe that we have a narrative like the other books of the Maccabees. The book is a *diatribe*<sup>2</sup>) or a tract “on the rule of reason over the passions”. This theme is illustrated through reference to Biblical stories, especially the martyr legends of 2 Macc. 6–7. This may have been the cause of the title.

The author who uses a Greek form of literature is nevertheless a Jew who has learned several things from Greek, especially Stoic philosophy. His aim is to exalt the Jewish Law, maintaining that the power to do it comes, not from Greek virtues, but from God. He believes in the vicarious suffering of the martyrs for their people (1, 11; 6, 29; 12, 21–22), and his belief in immortality has been transformed under the influence of Jewish conceptions (14, 6; 18, 23).

<sup>1</sup>) Eissfeldt, p. 668, cf. Skat Hoffmeyer, op. cit. p. 118 and Lindblom, *Senjudiskt fromhetslif enligt Salomons Psaltare*, (1909), p. 57. – Baumgartner, *The OT and Mod. St.* p. 229.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 181 and p. 255.



The *author's home* is not mentioned. Of course most critics think of *Alexandria*, but *Asia Minor* or *Syria* (Antioch) have also been proposed. The dependence upon 2 Macc. proves that the tract cannot have been composed before the middle of the first century B.C. The terminus ad quem is difficult to define. *A. Dupont-Sommer*, *Le quatrième livre des Machabées* (1939), describes the book as a *synagogue-sermon* from *Antioch*, where the tombs of the martyrs from Antiochus's persecution were, held on the commemoration-day of their martyrdom. He dates it to the year 117/18 A.D.

The text is preserved in several LXX-mss., but also in several mss. of *Josephus*, who accordingly must have been considered the author of the book, but without any justification.

*Editions:* The text is found in the edd. of LXX and Josephus.

*Commentaries* in the usual translations, cf. especially that of *Deissmann* in *Kautzsch*.

*Literature:* *Freudenthal*, *Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft* (1869). *Norden*, *Die antike Kunstprosa I* (1898, 3rd ed. 1915), pp. 416 ff. *Winckler*, *Das vierte Makkabäerbuch*, in *Altor. Forschungen*, 3rd. series I, 1 (1902), pp. 79 ff.

*S. Aalen*, *Die Begriffe 'Licht' und 'Finsternis'*. – (1951). pp. 218 ff.

## THE SIBYLLINE ORACLES

On *Hellenistic* soil we encounter a literature which may be called a parallel to Jewish Apocalyptic. Like the latter it is of *Oriental* origin, but it has been transferred to *Greek* circles and developed in a bulky "Sibylline literature", written in Greek hexameters. This type of literature is in the 2nd century B.C. adopted as an instrument of propaganda by *the Jews*. The Sibylla – among the Greeks a figure of fiction from pre-Homeric times – is here made the daughter-in-law of *Noah* (III, 826). The pious Israel is praised, the idols are ridiculed, and history is described in *vaticinia-ex-eventu*-form as already in the Oriental parallels of Greek literature<sup>1</sup>), but now with its scopus in the advent of the Messiah. The Jewish Sibyllines have been taken over by the *Christians*, who adapt them to their conceptions and add new oracles. About the 6th century A.D. all these oracles are compiled into one great collection, of which 12 books (I–VIII and XI–XIV) have been preserved. The *Jewish* elements are found in I–V and XI–XII, and in XIV, especially in III, IV, and V.

At the base of III we have a *Persian Sibylla* who predicts the history of *Alexander the Great*. To this material a Jewish editor adds an exaltation of the Jews (218–47, 573–600 et al.) and some descriptions of the Messianic age (619–22, 652–60, 702–31). Vv. 192–93, 318, and 608 are understood as allusions to *Ptolemy VII Physcon* (170–146 and 145–117 B.C.), and to his reign III

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 259.

is accordingly referred. But there are passages (52) which seem to allude to the 2nd triumvirate (43 B.C.) and to *Cleopatra* (d. 30 B.C.), cf. 75. This is interpreted as later work of editors. The book is considered of Egyptian-Jewish origin.

VI, 130–36 allude to the eruption of *Vesuvius* in 79 A.D. and 137–39 seem to know the idea of the return of *Nero*, and are accordingly dated to the end of the first century A.D. Nothing can be said of the place of their origin.

V seems to have been written after the time of *Hadrian* (117–138 A.D.) and after the time of his three successors (139–180), accordingly at the end of the 2nd century A.D. (vv. 1–51). From the lament on the fall of Jerusalem (397–413) it has however been inferred that the original nucleus of the book is earlier and dates from the time immediately after 70 A.D., from Egypt.

*Literature:* *Alexandre*, *Oracula Sibyllina* (1841–56). *Rzach*, *Oracula Sibyllina* (1891). *Geffcken* in *Hennecke*, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (1924), pp. 399–422; *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina* (*Texte und Untersuchungen* 23,1 (1902). *Rowley*, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1944), pp. 65 ff. (1947, p. 68 ff.)

## ENOCH

Under the name of *Enoch* (Gen. 5,21 ff.) three books are preserved, of which III Enoch does not concern us here<sup>1</sup>). The two works which are relevant to us are the *Ethiopic Enoch* and the *Slavonic Enoch*. The names are derived from the languages in which the books have been preserved. The books are quoted as *I* and *II Enoch*.

The *Ethiopic Enoch* (or *Henoch*, cf. the spelling in I Chron. 1,3 of the Authorized Version)<sup>2</sup>) is also, in fragments, known in *Greek* and *Latin* texts. The *Ethiopic* text was discovered in 1773 and is now known in ca. 30 mss. and is complete. It rests upon a *Greek* text which is a translation of a *Semitic* (Hebrew or Aramaic) original. In the early days of Christianity it has been popular in the Church (cf. the quotation in Jude 14–15), but later it was rejected and has only been preserved in the Canon of the *Ethiopic* (Abyssinian) Church<sup>3</sup>).

The book is an *apocalyptic compilation* of very different material.

<sup>1</sup>) cf. *H. Odeberg*, III Enoch (1928). The work mentioned by *Rowley*, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, p. 52, n. 1 (1947, p. 54, n. 2) (*G. S. Scholem*, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (1941)) I do not know. III Enoch is a later Jewish work. It is in *Hebrew*.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. the remarks in *The Westminster Dictionary of the Bible* on the spelling of the name.

<sup>3</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 41.

After a sermon of judgement (1-5) it describes the Fall of the Angels, their punishment, and the journeys of Enoch on the earth and in the underworld (6-36). In 37-71 (note the important sections 38-69, called the "*Parables*" (in German: "*Bildreden*" or "*Bilderreden*") we find different descriptions of "*The Son of Man*" (46,2ff.; 48,3; 62-63; 69,26ff.; 70-71; in the latter passage he seems to be identified with Enoch). 72-82 contain astronomical and calendrical teaching, 83-90 is apocalyptic historiography like Dan. 7ff.<sup>1</sup>). 91-105 are called the "*Admonitions*", but also contain an "*Apocalypse of Weeks*" in 93,1-14 91,12-17. 106-8 are the conclusion of the book, describing wonders at the birth of Noah and end with an admonition to endurance.

Several passages are probably originally *independent books*, partly furnished with *superscriptions* (37-71; 72-82; cf. 108). Some parts are not *Enoch*-passages, but deal with traditions of *Noah*, which certainly were originally independent (6-11; 39,1-2a; 54,7-55,2; 60; 65,1-69,25; 106-107), and perhaps are identical with a *Book of Noah* mentioned Jubil. 10,13 and 21,10.

The questions of *date* are solved according to the usual interpretation of apocalyptic literature. Some parts of the book were formerly considered earlier than the Book of Daniel, but this has recently been denied by Rowley<sup>2</sup>), who places the earliest sections in the Maccabaeen, not the pre-Maccabaeen age<sup>3</sup>), shortly after Dan.<sup>4</sup>). Other passages are dated after the Maccabaeen age, but before the Roman conquest of Palestine in 63 B.C. (85-90; 91-105, excl. the Apocalypse of Weeks; 37-71; 1-5; 83-84 and 108). 12-36; 81-182, 4a and 72-82 are dated before 150 B.C. These passages are assumed to be known by Jubil. 4,17-19.

The book contains a lot of foreign mythological material from different Oriental spheres of culture. All this is centred around the figure of *Enoch*<sup>5</sup>), who - cf. Ecclus. 44,16 - through his "walking with God" acquired secret wisdom, and through his being "taken away" by God got opportunity to make his wonderful journeys in the whole universe.

The real authors are generally thought to belong to *Pharisaic* circles, but this must not be taken in a too narrow meaning<sup>6</sup>). 82,2 seems to praise the *celibate*, and this has been taken as evidence of *Essene* influence<sup>7</sup>), but rejection of matrimony has not been a fundamental dogma among the *Essenes*<sup>8</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>) cf. vol. I, p. 259.

<sup>2</sup>) The Relevance of Apocalyptic (1944), pp. 75ff., 2nd ed. pp. 77ff.

<sup>3</sup>) op. cit., p. 52, 2nd ed. p. 54.

<sup>4</sup>) The pre-Maccabaeen date was especially assumed in the case of 93,1-14 + 91,12-17 and 6-39.

<sup>5</sup>) cf. vol. I, pp. 259f., 170, and 172f.

<sup>6</sup>) cf. Skat Hoffmeyer, op. cit., pp. 103-112 and 251ff.

<sup>7</sup>) Eissfeldt, p. 677.

<sup>8</sup>) Mosbech, Essæismen (1916), pp. 287ff.



*Editions:* Greek text: *Radermacher*, Das Buch Henoch, herausg.... von Flemming und Radermacher (1901). The LXX-ed. of *Swete*. *Ethiopic text:* *Dillmann*, Liber Henoch aethiopice (1851). *Flemming*, Das Buch Henoch, äthiopischer Text (in Texte und Untersuchungen 22,1) (1902). *Charles*, The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch... together with the fragmentary Greek and Latin Versions (1906).

*Commentaries* in *Kautzsch* and *Charles. Messel*, Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch (BeihZATW 1922). *Sjöberg*, Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch (1946). *Johs. Pedersen*, Zur Erklärung der eschatologischen Visionen Henochs (Islamica 1926, pp. 416–29). *Rowley* (cf. above). *Ludin Jansen*, Die Henochgestalt (1939).

The *Slavonic Enoch* is a translation from a Greek original. 30,13 explains the name of Adam by means of an acrostich, which is impossible in other languages than Greek. The book is dependent upon the recension known in the Ethiopic book, but is nevertheless upon the whole considered an independent development of the traditions concerning the figure of Enoch. The contents are upon the whole the same as those of the Ethiopic book, but it does not comprise the whole of the traditions there.

The book has been worked upon by *Christian* hands, but it is certainly originally a *Jewish* work. 51,4; 59,1–2; 61,4; 62,1 presuppose the existence of the temple in Jerusalem, and 70 A.D. is therefore generally considered its *terminus ad quem*. But against this date strong arguments have been pronounced, especially by *Burkitt*<sup>1)</sup> and *Fotheringham*<sup>2)</sup>, for a date not earlier than the 7th century A.D.<sup>3)</sup>.

*Edition:* The *Slavonic* text: *Novaković* (Starine, Agram (1884), pp. 67–81). *German translation:* *Bonwetsch*, Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs (Texte und Untersuchungen 42,2) (1922). *Rowley*, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, pp. 90ff.; in 2nd ed. (1947), pp. 95ff. *Rowley* accepts the probability of the late date of the book.

## THE ASSUMPTION OF MOSES

In the Letter of Jude, v. 9, we hear of a fight between the archangel Michael and Satan for the body of Moses. It is usually assumed that this is an allusion to a book on the *Ascension of Moses*. The book which is preserved under this title, however, in its present condition – a *Latin* translation from a *Greek* text, which in its turn rests upon a *Hebrew* or *Aramaic* original – does not contain anything of this kind, but is an *apocalypse* which Moses before his death reveals to Joshua. Early lists of apocryphal books mention two writings

<sup>1)</sup> *Burkitt*, Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (1914), pp. 75ff.

<sup>2)</sup> Journ. of Theol. Studies, in a debate with *Charles* (1919, p. 252; 1921, pp. 161ff.; 1922, pp. 49ff.) (quoted by *Rowley*, The Relevance..., 2nd ed. (1947), p. 95).

<sup>3)</sup> *Torrey*, Apoc. Lit., accordingly omits the book (p. 110. nr. 96).

concerning the last days of Moses, *the Testament of Moses*, and *the Assumption of Moses*. The contents of the preserved Assumption of Moses characterize the book as rather a Testament of Moses<sup>1</sup>). It has been supposed that a continuation relating the assumption of Moses and the fight between the archangel and Satan has been lost.

The apocalypse is a narrative in *ex eventu* form of the history of Israel down to the expected Messianic age. 6,1 alludes to the *Maccabaeen kings* in an inimical manner and to *Herod the Great*, giving the exact length of his reign from 37 B.C. to 4 B.C. Also his sons are mentioned, ending with the intervention of *Augustus* through *Sabinus* and *Varus* (Josephus, Ant. XVII, 10; Bellum II, 3-6). Like Dan. 11,40 this is the point in our apocalypse, where real prediction begins, and this determines the date of the book (7,1): Hypocritical men shall appear, an ungodly king will persecute the Jewish religion, a Levite *Taxo* and his seven sons will be ready to face martyrdom for their religion. At last the Kingdom of God comes.

The *date* must be determined to the time shortly after the intervention of Augustus *about 6 A.D.* or perhaps a little later. *Lattey*<sup>2</sup>) will place the book somewhat later, not long before A.D. 30. *Hölscher*<sup>3</sup>) proposes to date the book to a time shortly before the insurrection of Bar Cocheba (ca. 130 A.D.). But this has not won votes.

The polemic against the Maccabaeen kings has led to the assumption that the book originated in *Pharisaic* circles, but others think that ch. 7 is directed *against the Pharisees*. This seems to be the most probable solution<sup>4</sup>).

A riddle of the book which seems to be insoluble, is the Levite *Taxo*. He is perhaps a contemporary figure of the age when the book was written, who could not, for reasons unknown to us, be mentioned more explicitly<sup>5</sup>). According to *Torrey*<sup>6</sup>) *Taxo* is a cryptogram for "The Hasmonaeen", referring to Mattathias and his sons: "In the numerical value of the letters "Taxo" corresponds exactly to "the Hasmonaeen" in Aramaic, but not in Hebrew". This would indicate that the book was originally written in Aramaic. But *Torrey's* Aramaic form of the name is doubtful, and he gives a very artificial explanation of the fact that *Taxo* has 7 sons, while Mattathias only had 5.

<sup>1</sup>) Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, p. 86 f., 2nd ed. p. 92.

<sup>2</sup>) Catholic Biblical Quarterly 1942, pp. 9 ff., quoted by Rowley, *The Relevance of Apoc.*, p. 88, 2nd ed. p. 92.

<sup>3</sup>) ZNTW 1916.

<sup>4</sup>) Skat Hoffmeyer, pp. 137-42.

<sup>5</sup>) Rowley, op. cit. pp. 128 ff., 2nd ed. pp. 134 ff.

<sup>6</sup>) Apoc. Lit., p. 116, but cf. the discussion in Rowley, *Relevance ..* 2nd ed., p. 139.

The *Latin text* is edited by *Ceriani*, *Monumenta Sacra et Profana* 1,1 (1861), and of course in *Fritzsche. Clemen*, *Die Himmelfahrt des Mose* (1904), in *Lietzmann's Kleine Texte. Commentaries* in the standard translations. *Hölscher*, *ZNTW* 1916, pp. 108–27 and 149–58. *Kuhn*, *ZATW* 1925, pp. 124–29.

A retranslation into Greek in *Hilgenfeld*, *Messias Judaeorum* (1869), pp. 435–68.

A curious 14th century fresco in the parish church of *Kirkerup* in Sjælland, Denmark, represents a picture of a bearded man with horns, sitting in a boat-shaped carriage, holding a staff with two twings, before him is a pot. The horns seem to indicate that the man is *Moses*. The theory has been advanced that the picture is connected with the Assumption of *Moses*, who is here represented sitting in the Ark of the Covenant, with the staff of Aaron, the tablets of the Law, and the pot with manna. If this idea were right, the picture might bring a supplement to the book, where – as said above – the description of the assumption is missing. I would prefer to assume that the carriage is not the Ark, but some havenly carriage like the chariot of *Elijah*. But it seems probable that the story of the assumption of *Moses* may have been known and be the basis of the representation of the picture.<sup>1)</sup>

## THE FOURTH BOOK OF EZRA (OR: 2ND ESDRAS)

The *title* of the book varies very much<sup>2)</sup>.

It contains *seven visions* of *Ezra*, dated in the 30th year after the fall of Jerusalem (according to our chronology 557 B.C.). Before these visions chs. 1–2 bring material from *Christian circles*, corresponding to chs. 15–16.

The *Jewish* material, chs. 3–14, revolve around the question, why Israel had to suffer so deeply, although it was not worse than other nations, above all: not worse than Babylon, and the problem why so few people are saved. Through the traditional apocalyptic symbols the world to come and the Messiah are described. The *fifth vision* (10,60–12,51) contains an interpretation of Dan. 7, in which the fourth monster is identified with the Empire of Rome, and 13,1–58 (the *sixth vision*) is a parallel to the vision of the *Son of Man* in Dan. 7, but with an individual conception of the figure. Important for the history of the OT Canon is the *seventh vision* (14,1–48)<sup>3)</sup>, describing *Ezra's* restoration of Holy Scripture.

But the destruction of Jerusalem to which the Jewish chapters constantly refer, is in reality the fall of the Holy City in 70 A.D. The book is a moving

<sup>1)</sup> cf. *Broby-Johansen*, *Den danske Billedbibel*, (1947), p. 56. In Danmarks Kirker, Københavns Amt, p. 755f., is only the question advanced if the man is *Moses* or *Elijah*. But the hypothesis of *Broby-Johansen* cannot be called impossible.

<sup>2)</sup> cf. above, p. 205.

<sup>3)</sup> cf. vol. I, p. 26.



expression of the despair which had seized Jewish circles. But perhaps the most impressive thing in the book is that the author (or authors) have not become narrow-minded through the disaster. With the desperate situation of the Jewish nation the book everywhere combines the problems which concern everyone. It is the common human problem of *guilt and reward* which is the temptation, and which sometimes makes the author speak in words reminding us of the speeches of Job. But – different from Job – the book has a definite, wider *hope of a future, of the world to come*.

The *unity* of the Jewish chapters has been disputed<sup>1</sup>). The *date* is rather easily determined. Ch. 10,60ff. knows the Roman *Flavian* emperors, and the book seems to have come into existence under the last of them, *Domitianus* (81–96), or soon after his death. If *Babylon* (as in the contemporary Apocalypse of John) is a symbolic name for Rome, it may be assumed that the book was written there. The real name of the author is – as in the case of most apocalyptists – unknown to us. He has been a gifted visionary soul, a great poet, a strongly sensitive nature, suffering under the need of his people and all men. A beautiful expression of the love of God is given in 8,47, where the author, unconsciously, gives a grand evidence of his own love of men<sup>2</sup>).

The book is preserved in *Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, Armenian, Sahidic, and Georgian*, but was certainly originally written in *Hebrew*. It has, as the Christian editorial work shows, also been greatly appreciated in the Church.

All *texts* (the *Oriental* ones in German translation with reference to editions of the originals)) are collected in *Violet*, *Die Ezra–Apokalypse* (in the Berlin edition of the Church Fathers). *German translation*, also by *Violet*, *Die Apokalypsen des Ezra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt* (1924). Besides the commentaries in *Kautzsch* (by *Gunkel*) and *Charles* (*Box*, who also has published his own commentary, *The Ezra–Apocalypse* (1912)) the reader is referred to the important commentary of *Oesterley*: *II Esdras* (1933 – in the Westminster Commentaries). *Wellhausen*, *Zur Apokalyptischen Literatur* (Skizzen und Vorarbeiten 6, (1889), pp. 215–49). *Mundle*, *Das religiöse Problem des IV Esrabuches*, ZATW 1929, pp. 222–49.

Especially to 1–2 and 15–16: *Weinel* in *Hennecke*, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (1924), pp. 390ff.

*Rowley* (cf. above).

<sup>1</sup>) See the treatment in *Rawley*, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, pp. 94ff. and 132ff. 2nd ed., pp. 99ff. and 141ff, where all relevant literature is quoted, with great reservation against the documentary theories, cf. especially the quotation from *Lagrange*, on p. 94 n. 2: "The mosaic is in the ideas, not in the documents". – *Torrey*, *Apoc. Lit.*, still assumes a Shealtiel–Apocalypse, which has been combined with a story of Ezra.

<sup>2</sup>) cf. *Eissfeldt*, p. 682.

## THE SYRIAC APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH

Like the preceding work this one can be divided into *seven parts*. The subject is also here the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C., in reality that of 70 A.D.

*Baruch*, the friend of Jeremiah, is left alone among the ruins and receives revelations concerning the fate of Zion and of the future: After the reconstruction of the town it will again be destroyed and then restored in the Messianic times. We encounter a vision concerning the *Four World Empires* (§§ 35–46), the last ruler of which is killed by the *Messiah*, and other visions concerning the future of Israel.

Like 4th Ezra the book belongs to the days *after 70 A.D.* It also exhibits the universalistic outlook of 4th Ezra, but it is not so pessimistic. The author is more rooted in the hope of the future. It is supposed that the book is dependent upon 4th Ezra, but the relations cannot be determined with any certainty. Both books have been considered dependent upon a third work, *Antiquitates Biblicae*<sup>1</sup>). The Baruch–Apocalypse is at least later than 4th Ezra, but earlier than the *Epistle of Barnabas*, in which it is quoted (9,9). Accordingly the Baruch–Apoc. must have been written before 130 A.D. It does not know the insurrection of Bar Cocheba.

The book is preserved intact in *Syriac*, in fragments in *Greek*. The original language is supposed to have been *Hebrew* or *Aramaic*.

*Text: Syriac*, in *Ceriani*, Monumenta Sacra et Profana V, 2 (1871). Patrologia Syriaca accur. Graffin I, 2 (1907), cols. 1056ff. *Latin* translation in *Fritzsche*, pp. 654ff. *Greek fragments* in *Charles* (II, pp. 487ff.). *German* translation by *Violet* (cf. above, p. 247). Commentaries in the standard translations.

*Rowley*, op. cit. pp. 98ff. and 133ff.; 2nd ed. pp. 103ff. and 142ff. – *Eissfeldt*, p. 25.

## THE GREEK APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH

Setting aside ch. 1, in which *Baruch* laments the fate of Jerusalem and receives a word of consolation, the book is a cosmological description of Baruch's journey through the heavens and his return. Parts of the book (e.g. chs. 6–8) are of real poetical value. It has been *edited in Christian circles* (in ch. 4 we find an allusion to the Sacrament of the Holy Supper), but is probably *originally Jewish*. There is much Greek Gnostic influence. It is known in another form by *Origen* and is later than the Syriac Baruch–Apocalypse, which it presupposes.

It is preserved in *Greek* and in a *Slavonic* translation.

<sup>1</sup>) See *James*, The Biblical Antiquities of Philo 1917); on this work see now *A. Spiro*, Samaritans, Tobiads, and Judahites in Ps.-Philo (1951) referring to an edition by *Kisch* (1949).

The *Greek* text in *M. R. James*, *Apocrypha anecdota* II (Texts and Studies V, 1) (1897), with an *English* translation of the *Slavonic* text. This text is edited by *Novaković* (Starine, Agram, 1886, pp. 203 ff.). *German* translation: *Bonwetsch*, *Das slavisch erhaltene Baruch-Buch* (Nachr. der Göttinger Ges. d. Wissensch., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1896, pp. 91 ff.). *Commentaries* in *Kautzsch* and *Charles*. – *Lüdke*, in *ZATW* 1911, pp. 219–22. *Rowley*, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, p. 98, n. 1, 2nd ed. p. 103, n. 1.

## THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

The form of the book reminds us of Gen. 49 or Dt. 33. It contains a series of last words of the 12 sons of Jacob. But unlike the Biblical models they do not contain only predictions, but also admonitions, starting from the description of the patriarchs. The Biblical story is embellished as in the Book of Jubilees. It has been assumed that the basis of the Testaments are synagogue-sermons on the patriarchs.

In many passages *Levi* gets a predominant position at the cost of *Judah*. This is thought to reflect conditions of *Maccabaeen* times. In some places the decline of the dynasty seems to have left its mark (the time of *Alexander Jannai* 102–76 B.C.). Accordingly the original of the book is placed in the *first century B.C.* Later it has been edited by *Christians*. The Christian interpolations are partly missing in the *Armenian* text.

We know two *Greek* forms of the book, and – as just mentioned – an *Armenian* version, and also a *Slavonic* one. Behind these texts a *Hebrew* or *Aramaic* original is supposed. In the edition of *Charles* (cf. below) a *Hebrew* text of *Test. Napht.* according to *Gaster* is given, which more probably is a later edition of the *Greek* tradition. Of *Test. Levi* we also have *Greek* and *Aramaic*, perhaps also originally *Hebrew* parallels, which are more detailed than the text of the *Greek* book, and which seem to be earlier than 70 A.D.

*Greek text:* *Charles*, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (1898). On the *Armenian* text: *Preuschen*, *ZATW* 1900, pp. 106 ff. *Slavonic* and *Armenian* readings are published by *Charles*.

*Commentaries* in *Kautzsch* and *Charles*. – *Bousset*, *ZATW* 1900, pp. 141 ff. and 187 ff. *Eppel*, *Le Piétisme Juif dans les Testaments des Douze Patriarches* (1930). *Rowley*, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, pp. 60 ff., 2nd ed. pp. 63 ff. *Widengren*, *Horae Soederblomianae* I (Mélanges Johs Pedersen, fasc. III) (1947), pp. 1–12.

## THE LIFE OF ADAM AND EVE

Under this title we possess a rich literature, mostly originating in the Church. But in the case of the two earliest books a *Jewish* original and perhaps a *Hebrew* original text is supposed. This material comprises a *Latin* translation



of a Greek book, the *Vita Adae et Evae*, and a Greek book, mainly a parallel to the just mentioned story, by Tischendorf wrongly named *Apocalypsis Mosis*. Both works give a haggadic story of the first human beings after the Fall until the death and burial of Adam and Eve. The story very often is of great beauty. It is strongly *ascetic*. According to allusions to the *Herodian temple* the books must have been written between 20 B.C. and 70 A.D.

*Latin text:* W. Meyer, *Vita Adae et Evae* (Abhandl. d. Münchener Akad., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1878, pp. 185 ff.). *Greek text:* Tischendorf, *Apocalypsis Mosis* (in *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, 1877). Ceriani, *Monumenta Sacra et Profana* V, 1 (1868). Commentaries in Kautzsch and Charles. M. R. James, *The lost Apocrypha of the OT* (1920), pp. 1 ff. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, p. 92, 2nd ed. p. 98f.

### THE APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM

This apocalypse is preserved in a *Slavonic* version. It is thought to be a *Jewish* book, which has been worked over by Christian hands. It is dated *after* 70 A.D. and the *terminus ad quem* is probably the early part of the *second* century. It rests upon the haggadic development of the story of Abraham, which flourishes in later Jewish legend, describing his fight against idolatry in Mesopotamia and his subsequent emigration. The apocalyptic parts have some specialities in the angelology, but does not differ much from the usual plan of such works.

Box, *The Apocalypse of Abraham* (1919). Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, pp. 105 ff., 2nd ed. pp. 111 ff.

### THE TESTAMENT OF ABRAHAM

This work is transmitted in two *Greek* recensions. The date is disputed, some arguing for a date in the *second century A.D.* and considering it a *Christian* work, while others place it in the *first century A.D.* and think that it is a *Jewish* book with Christian interpolations. It describes the death of Abraham, who before dying sees the world and all created things and the vanity of the earth, and is favoured by many visions, revealing to him the shapes and the limitation of the reign of death. In several points this Apocalypse is different from the usual sort of this kind of literature. There is *no background of historical crisis*, and it is mostly interested in the fate of the *individual*. There is an idea of a threefold judgment, the second one being nationalistic, not fitting well into the individualistic scope of the work. There is *no idea of a Messiah*, but the idea of (seven) *world ages* is hinted at. Interesting is the figure of the *angel*

of death, and the idea of the *weighing of souls*, reminiscent of Egyptian ideology.

*James: The Testament of Abraham* (1892). Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, p. 107f., 2nd ed. p. 113f.

## THE OLD TESTAMENT AND AFTER

As noted in vol. I, p. 21 and p. 41, the number of "outside books", as the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha with a word found in Rabbinic literature are called in *Torrey's The Apocryphal Literature* (p. 8), cannot be given exactly. The translation of *Charles*, e.g., contains the *Story of Ahikar*, the so-called "*Fragments of a Zadokite Work*", and the Mishnaic "*Sayings of the Fathers*", while *Torrey* and *Pfeiffer* include *The Lives of the Prophets*, edited anew by *Torrey* in 1946<sup>1</sup>), a text of very great interest, and *The Testament of Job*, the original of which is assumed to be pre-Christian. There seems to exist a tendency to include such literature as may be – at different times – of interest for Old and New Testament scholars. The historical value of such literature is the light it throws upon the intertestamental age and the years after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. If we were to act quite consistently, we should have to expand the Introduction to the Old Testament not only to include the writings here alluded to, but also the whole Jewish literature from the centuries after the conclusion of the Old Testament, both Hellenistic and Palestinian works. The non-canonical writings form a background of the Bible, like the Old Oriental literature from earlier ages. While these more ancient texts in many respects give us opportunity to study the *pre-suppositions* of Old Testament literature, so the "outside books" of the intertestamental period exhibit a picture of the *effects* of the Biblical writings. They present us with a link between the Old Testament books and those of the New Testament, but also a link between the Old Testament and the Rabbinic literature of the first millenium A.D. Here we stand at the beginnings of that history, which *Eissfeldt* has called "*Die Wirkungsgeschichte des Alten Testaments*", the story of the influence of the Old Testament in the history of the World and the Church. *Eissfeldt* points out that, on the one hand, scientific criticism pays a far greater attention, through the ages, to the Old Testament than to any

<sup>1</sup>) *The Lives of the Prophets*, Greek Text and Translation, by C. C. *Torrey* (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, Monograph Series, vol. I, 1946). – In *The OT and Modern Study* p. 229 *Baumgartner* mentions *Pseudo-Phocylides*, by an Alexandrian Jew who combines elementary Wisdom with material from the Law and from Greek philosophers.

other document of ancient religion, but only because this book, both in Judaism and in Christianity, stands as a unique source of religious life and as revealed normative rule of faith and ethics. On the other hand the scientific investigation of the books of the Old Testament provides instruments for the dialogue between Judaism and Christianity, which began when the Church separated itself from the Synagogue and began to assert its rights as the sole rightful proprietor of the Promises to Israel. Jewish and Christian scholars can, in this investigation, walk a long way together. But when they reach the vital questions of spiritual and religious character, the theological problems of Promise and Fulfilment, of Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ of the Promises, then they must part, each party asserting its faith. But also for the assertion of the faith the investigation of the literature of the Old Testament is of major importance, for the right understanding of texts and books, as used in the theological debate.

An finally, with *Eissfeldt*, we must underline that *Church History* also must bring out the effects of the Old Testament in the Church. A Christianity outside the influence of the Old Testament does not exist. At times the Old Testament has threatened to submerge the genuinely Christian ideas. During other ages, or in other places, an anti-Old Testament feeling has sprung up. But since the Church, in opposition to Marcion and the Gnostics, maintained the Old Testament as Holy Scripture, its effects have been there, directly through sermon and theology, liturgical and private reading, or indirectly through the impact of its words and phrases and thoughts on poetry, hymns and secular songs and fiction.

An so it will be until the end of time.

*Literature:* Montefiore, *The Old Testament and After* (1923). *The Legacy of Israel*, planned by J. Abrahams and ed. by E. R. Bevan and Charles Singer (1928 and later reprints).



# INDEXES

## I. NAMES

(see also special list for the Appendix).

- Aalders: I 19. II 16.  
Aalen, S.: II 242.  
Aarne: I 234.  
Aaron: I 204. II 21, 33, 36, 37, 67, 82, 246.  
Aaron benMose ben Asher: I 54, 57.  
Abdon: II 87.  
Abel: II 147.  
Abiathar: I 248. II 92, 115.  
Abibaal: I 45.  
Abigail: I 204.  
Abimelech: II 87, 89.  
Abner: I 136.  
Abraham: I 57, 188, 211, 237, 238, 264.  
    II 21, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 35,  
    36, 37, 47, 49, 50, 51, 59, 60, 75, 250,  
    251.  
Abraham Ibn Ezra: See Ibn Ezra.  
Abrahams, I: II 223, 252.  
Absalom: II 93.  
Abu Sa'id: I 67.  
Acosta: II 200.  
'Ada: I 45.  
Adam: I 117, II 28, 32, 51, 211, 244, 249,  
    250.  
Addis: II 16.  
Adonis: I 132. II 238.  
Adrianus: I 9.  
Aggæus: II 155.  
Agur: I 169. II 171, 172.  
Ahab: I 45, 193, 237, 244. II 84, 147.  
Ahaz: II 147, 149.  
Ahijah: I 239. II 212.  
Ahikam: I 171.  
Ahikar: I 169, 170, 180, 183, 246, II 225,  
    251.  
Ahiram: I 45, 135.  
Akhenaten: I 114.  
Akiba: I 30, 52, 69, 77, 89, 90, 106, 127,  
    132. II 42, 180, 182.  
Albertus Magnus: I 41.  
Albright: I 17, 114, 118, 122, 224. II 16,  
    39, 45, 51, 52, 57, 84, 123, 137, 153, 174,  
    210, 214, 215, 238.  
Alcuin: I 41.  
Alfrink: II 196.  
Allgeier: I 87. II 170.  
Alleyn, Edward: I 9.  
Allwohn: II 133.  
Alexander Jannai: II 227, 249.  
Alexander the Great: I 74, 143. II 117, 152,  
    159, 172, 196, 198, 222, 241.  
Alexander Polyhistor: I 75.  
Alexandre: II 242.  
Alt, Albrecht: I 7, 55, 60, 211, 212, 219,  
    224, 228, 232, 249. II 23, 74, 83, 84,  
    86, 92, 133, 227.  
Amalek: I 139, 143.  
Aman: I 93.  
Amasis: II 117.  
Amaziah: II 139, 140.  
Ambakum: II 151, 229.  
Ambrose: I 79, 90. II 103.  
Amenemope: I 169. II 172.  
Amittai: II 144.  
Amos: I 36, 41, 117, 137, 180, 193, 198,  
    199, 201, 202, 253, 257. II 59, 129, 130,  
    138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 147.  
Amöz: II 103.  
Amraphel: II 60.  
Anan ben David: I 55.  
Andersen, Hans: I 241. II 225.  
Anderson, G. W.: I 106, 118. II 149.  
André: II 155.  
Andrä, Tor: I 177, 178, 194. II 197.  
Anii: I 256.  
Ankermann: I 20.  
Antiochus IV Epiphanes: II 190, 193, 196,  
    198, 199, 204, 221, 222, 233, 238, 241.  
Aphraates: I 73.  
Aptowitz: I 51, 56, 58. II 7.

- Aquila: I 46, 51, 56, 69, 71, 78, 82, 89, 90, 91, 266. II 169.  
 Aristaeas: I 37, 44, 75, 77, 81, 82, 83, 85, 114, 178, 213. II 236, 237.  
 Aristobulus: I 74.  
 Aristotle: II 200.  
 Arnold, W. R.: II 89.  
 Arphaxad: II 226.  
 Artaxerxes: I 22, 26, 34, 36, 211. II 73, 207, 208, 210.  
 Artaxerxes II: II 207.  
 Artaxerxes III Ochus: II 226.  
 Asaph: I 166, 254. II 165.  
 Ashera: II 67.  
 Asher Forins: I 70.  
 Asmodacus: II 224, 225.  
 Assurbanipal: I 106, 211. II 116, 149, 173.  
 Astruc, Jean: II 12, 14, 27, 28, 32.  
 Athaliah: II 214.  
 Athanasius: I 20, 40.  
 Athias, Johs.: I 60.  
 Audet: I 32, 40, 68. II 103, 203, 205, 211, 220.  
 Auerbach: II 92.  
 Augustine: I 9, 40, 83, 86, 87, 92. II 52, 103, 129, 155.  
 Augustus: II 245.  
 Auvray, P.: II 129.  
 Azariah: II 229.  
  
 Baal: I 100, 193, 236, 237. II 91, 134, 154.  
 Bachmann: I 123. II 115, 129, 188.  
 Bacon: II 16.  
 Baentsch: II 29, 123.  
 Baer: I 57, 60.  
 Bagoas: II 226.  
 Bagohi: II 210.  
 Baikie: I 171.  
 Bailey, H. W.: I 104, 105.  
 Balaam: I 140, 142, 143, 145, 163, 167, 184, 257. II 21, 46, 51, 59, 77, 129.  
 Ball, J. C.: II 147.  
 Balla: I 165. II 151.  
 Balscheit: II 106.  
 Barak: II 87.  
 Bar Cocheba: I 46, 52. II 248.  
 Barnabas: I 91. II 248.  
 Barnes, W. E.: I 74.  
 Barth, Christoph: I 159.  
 Barton: I 114, 117, 129, 133, 182, 183, 194, 211, 232, 241, 245, 255, 259. II 197.  
 Baruch: I 21, 24, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 105, 106, 107, 117, 165, 213. II 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 231, 232, 233, 247, 248, 249.  
 Battersby Harford: II 29.  
 Baudissin: I 67, 159.  
 Bauer, Hans: I 48, 221.  
 Bauer, Walter: I 20, 47, 50, 54, 55, 57, 63, 80, 199, 211, 232. II 168, 240.  
 Baumann II 142.  
 Baumgartner: I 44, 47, 63, 118, 159, 183, 236. II 46, 61, 101, 121, 122, 173, 179, 182, 191, 193, 200, 203, 225, 230, 234, 236, 237, 240, 251.  
 Baumgärtel: I 76, 80, 86. II 237.  
 Bea: II 16.  
 Beck: I 72.  
 Beer: I 213. II 34, 47, 52, 56.  
 Beeri: II 130.  
 Begrich: I 14, 116, 121, 191, 248. II 98, 99.  
 Bel: I 37. II 151, 195, 228, 229, 230, 231.  
 Bellmann: II 230.  
 Belshazzar: II 196, 197.  
 Ben Asher: I 54, 55, 59, 60, 64.  
 Benjamin: I 236. II 58, 84, 87.  
 Ben Naphtali: I 55, 59, 64.  
 Ben Sira: See the Siracid.  
 Bentesina: I 211.  
 Benzinger: I 193. II 69, 98.  
 Berechiah: II 157.  
 Berger: I 93.  
 Berggrav: I 232.  
 Bergsträsser: I 55.  
 Berliner: I 70.  
 Bernard of Clairvaux: II 180.  
 Bertheau: II 194.  
 Bertholet, A.: I 7, 21, 98, 105, II 38, 52, 72, 115, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 138, 140, 202, 210, 211, 216, 220.  
 Bertholdt: II 109, 157, 184.  
 Bertram: I 86.  
 Berth: I 234.  
 Bevan, E.: II 236.  
 Bewer: II 146, 147.  
 Beza, Theodore: I 48.  
 Beyer: I 202.  
 Bič, M.: II 139.  
 Bickell: I 120.  
 Bickermann: I 81. II 199, 222, 223.

- Bildad: II 174, 177.  
 Billerbeck: II 144.  
 Bird, Th. E.: II 170.  
 Birkeland, H.: I 17, 103, 104, 107, 197. II 115, 119, 120, 121, 124, 126, 127, 141.  
 Bissel: II 16.  
 Blackman: I 114.  
 Bleek: I 12. II 14, 155, 199, 203.  
 Bleeker, C. J.: II 169.  
 Bloch: I 74.  
 Boaz: II 182.  
 Boer, P. A. H. de: II 96.  
 Bomberg, Daniel: I 53, 55, 58. II 91.  
 Bonaventura: I 41.  
 Bonfrère, J.: II 11.  
 Bonsirven: II 218.  
 Bonwetsch: II 140, 244, 249.  
 Borchardt: I 212.  
 Born, van den: II 129.  
 Boschwitz, F.: II, 16.  
 Boström: I 127, 168, 175, 180, 183.  
 Boussuet: I 258. II 119, 218, 249.  
 Bowman, R. A.: II 19, 52, 61, 63.  
 Box: I 34, 125. II 247, 250.  
 Boylan: II 170.  
 Breit: I 209.  
 Briggs: II 16.  
 Brix: II 225.  
 Broby-Johansen: II 246.  
 Brockelmann: I 72.  
 Brooke: I 85.  
 Brownlee: II 108.  
 Bruno, Arvid: I 122, 233.  
 Bruyne, de: II 234.  
 Brüll: II 230, 231.  
 Brönno, E.: I 79.  
 Budde, Karl: I 14, 25, 35, 120, 122, 168, 249, 260. II 15, 16, 18, 21, 88, 90, 92, 95, 125, 152, 153, 176, 177, 179, 181.  
 Budge, Wallis: I 27.  
 Buhl: I 13, 21, 22, 27, 31, 32, 37, 39, 40, 46, 96, 119, 133, 168, 192, 200, 209, 212, 213, 232. II 16, 26, 28, 42, 47, 98, 115, 123, 159, 170, 179, 191, 208, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 234, 240.  
 Bulmerincq: II 160, 162.  
 Bultmann: I 255.  
 Burkitt, F. C.: I 87, 90. II 240, 244, 252.  
 Burney: II 91.  
 Burrows, Millar: I 98.  
 Buxtorf, sen.: I 10, 27, 55, 59, 62.  
 Buxtorf, J. jun.: I 10, 62.  
 Buzi: II 122.  
 Bücher: I 146.  
 Böhme: II 129, 145.  
 Cain: I 186, 237.  
 Calès: II 170.  
 Caligula: II 236.  
 Calvin: I 39: II 105, 180.  
 Cannon: II 152.  
 Capellus: I 10, 62.  
 Carpenter: II 16, 29.  
 Carpzow: I 27, 62.  
 Caspari: I 229. II 96.  
 Cassiodorus: I 9.  
 Cassuto: II 17, 25.  
 Castellino: I 152.  
 Castellio: II 180.  
 Castellus: I 59.  
 Cazelles, H.: I 232. II 44, 56, 122, 228.  
 Causse, A.: I 146. II 15.  
 Celsus: II 10.  
 Ceriani: I 73, 79. II 238, 246, 248, 250.  
 Chalcol: I 169.  
 Chantepie de la Saussaye: I 131, 140.  
 Charles, R. H.: I 21, 34, 41, 125, 170, 183. II 201, 205, 218, 225, 228, 232, 237, 238, 240, 244, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251.  
 Chayyim, Jacob ben: I 49, 53, 54, 55, 58, 60.  
 Chester Beatty: I 44, 80, 82. II 204.  
 Cheyne: II 105, 106, 107, 146.  
 Chilion: II 182.  
 Chrysostom: II 13, 67.  
 Cicero: I 142, 181, 213.  
 Clemen: II 68, 201, 246.  
 Clemens Alexandrinus: I 74.  
 Clement VIII: I 92.  
 Clement Rom.: I 91.  
 Cleopatra: II 231, 242.  
 Clericus: I 11, 62. II 11.  
 Cobb, J. H.: I 121. II 170.  
 Colenso: II 14, 34.  
 Commodus: I 91.  
 Contenau: I 212.  
 Cooke: I 29, 48, 135, 211, 220. II 127.  
 Coppens: II 60, 80, 167.  
 Cornill: I 44, 64, 95.  
 la Cour, V.: I 136.  
 Cowley: I 170, 183, 211, 213. II 228, 234.



- Cranmer: I 142.  
 Credner: II 135, 136.  
 Cripps: II 143.  
 Croesus: II 105.  
 Cumming: I 152.  
 Curtis: II 216.  
 Cush: II 153.  
 Cyprian: I 86. II 233.  
 Cyril of Jerusalem: I 40.  
 Cyrus: I 230. II 104, 105, 109, 112, 197, 198, 211, 220.  
  
 Dagon: I 236.  
 Dahse: II 17, 27.  
 Dalman, Gustaf: I 27, 72, 123, 126, 131. II 227.  
 Damasus: I 92.  
 Damkina: I 188.  
 Dan: II 58, 87.  
 Danek: II 46.  
 Daniel: I 12, 21, 25, 26, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 68, 76, 80, 91, 106, 109, 172, 173, 178, 237, 238, 247, 257. II 33, 60, 81, 135, 151, 155, 159, 163, 174, 175, 187, 195, 197, 198, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 216, 217, 222, 229, 230, 234, 243.  
 Danby: II 171.  
 Darda: I 169.  
 Darius: II 219, 220.  
 Darius I: II 200, 207.  
 Darius the Mede: II 197, 198.  
 Dathe: I 71.  
 Daube, D.: II 80.  
 David: I 26, 51, 111, 112, 118, 120, 130, 134, 135, 136, 137, 141, 142, 148, 157, 159, 161, 167, 171, 186, 204, 206, 212, 215, 228, 229, 230, 237, 238, 240, 243, 244, 248, 254, 263. II 18, 19, 49, 54, 58, 60, 68, 84, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 106, 111, 115, 140, 141, 142, 165, 166, 172, 182, 183, 185, 188, 190, 211, 215, 216, 239.  
 De Wette: I 12, 218. II 13, 14, 15, 19, 46, 67.  
 Debora: I 111, 138, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 150, 152. II 87, 88, 90, 167.  
 Deissmann: I 213. II 241.  
 Delacroix: II 79.  
 Delcor: II 159.  
 Delitzsch, Franz: I 12, 60, 99, 128. II 14, 104, 180, 190.  
 Delitzsch, Friedr: II 151.  
 Demetrius: I 75.  
 Demetrius from Phaleron: II 236.  
 Denk: I 87.  
 Dennefeld I 39, 41.  
 Dérenbourg, J. I 72.  
 Deutero-Isaiah: I 24, 117, 151, 152, 162, 164, 165, 200, 202, 241, 253, II 36, 81, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 123, 137, 142, 159, 167, 230, 232.  
 Deutero-Zechariah: II 161.  
 Dhorme: I 181. II 179.  
 Diblaim: II 131.  
 Dietrich: I 74.  
 Dillmann, A.: I 88. II 14, 30, 32, 47, 66, 70, 121, 176, 179, 238, 244.  
 Diodorus Siculus: I 44. II 143.  
 Diringer: I 48. II 7.  
 Doederlein: II 104, 105.  
 Domitianus: II 247.  
 Dornseiff: II 17.  
 Driver, S. R.: I 12, 13, 79, 95, 212. II 6, 7, 16, 29, 33, 37, 42, 70, 92, 124, 134, 138, 164, 168, 179, 185, 192, 194, 200, 205, 213.  
 Driver, G. R.: I 44, 48, 99, 183, 232. II 98.  
 Duauf: I 170.  
 Dubnow: II 11.  
 Dugmore, C.W.: I 9.  
 Duhm: I 96, 191, 193, 194. II 92, 109, 110, 117, 118, 119, 121, 125, 130, 134, 151, 152, 153, 203.  
 Dupont-Sommer, A.: II 241.  
 Dussaud: I 171. II 123.  
 Dürr, L.: I 174, 260. II 129.  
  
 Ea: I 188.  
 Ebeling: II 191.  
 Edelkoort: II 151, 153, 154.  
 Edom: I 142, 237.  
 Eerdmans, B. D.: II 17.  
 Ehelolf: I 232.  
 Ehud: II 87.  
 Eichhorn, J. C.: I 11. II 12, 14, 104, 105, 159, 176.

Eichrodt: II 35, 36, 37, 43, 64.

Eilers: I 232.

Eising: I 243.

Eissfeldt: I 7, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 23, 25, 26, 28, 36, 41, 43, 46, 55, 56, 60, 61, 75, 87, 95, 102, 103, 107, 108, 120, 121, 124, 125, 127, 129, 136, 138, 139, 141, 143, 145, 146, 148, 149, 151, 153, 165, 168, 169, 176, 178, 186, 194, 196, 199, 202, 203, 206, 207, 208, 210, 213, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 232, 233, 243, 245, 246, 247, 252, 253, 256, 257, 259, 260, 263, 264. II 5, 9, 16, 17, 18, 19, 24, 30, 31, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 60, 73, 85, 89, 90, 92, 94, 98, 99, 100, 101, 105, 107, 110, 111, 117, 118, 119, 126, 131, 133, 134, 135, 139, 140, 143, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, 153, 154, 156, 159, 160, 162, 163, 165, 173, 176, 177, 178, 180, 182, 183, 185, 186, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 194, 202, 212, 213, 215, 220, 221, 223, 227, 235, 236, 240, 243, 247, 251, 252.

Eleazar: II 82, 233, 234.

Elhanan: I 240.

Eli: I 186. II 89, 93.

Eliashib: II 207.

Elias Levita: I 41, 55, 62.

Eliezer: II 60.

Elihu: II 175, 176.

Elijah: I 118, 193, 194, 237, 239, 249. II 65, 91, 98, 100, 133, 161, 162.

Elimelech: II 182.

Eliphaz: II 174, 177.

Elisha: I 140, 237, 239, 249. II 98, 100.

Ellekilde, H.: I 234.

Elliger: II 109, 147, 154, 159.

Elon: II 87.

Engnell, J.: I 17, 23, 95, 96, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 108, 110, 112, 113, 115, 123, 124, 127, 128, 129, 132, 133, 134, 144, 145, 147, 149, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 167, 168, 172, 173, 174, 175, 179, 183, 184, 186, 189, 190, 193, 194, 195, 196, 200, 213, 216, 235, 246, 251, 257, 258. II 7, 9, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 31, 33, 35, 36,

40, 60, 61, 62, 64, 71, 73, 75, 76, 79, 83, 84, 85, 86, 98, 99, 102, 108, 111, 113, 114, 130, 131, 132, 139, 142, 143, 147, 150, 152, 153, 156, 157, 167, 175, 177, 181, 188, 212, 213, 215, 216, 220.

Enoch, (Henoch): I 170, 173, 177, 258, 259, 260. II 71, 237, 242, 243, 244.

Ephraem Eyrus: I 73.

Epiphanius: I 40, 89, 90, 91. II 10.

Eppel: II 249.

Erman: I 119, 125, 129, 170, 173, 183, 255, 256, 259.

Esau: I 237, 241.

Esdras, see Ezra.

Ess, van: I 85.

Esther: I 10, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 58, 71, 76, 80, 166, 208, 240, 241, 247, 264. II 163, 184, 187, 192, 193, 194, 195, 216, 223, 227, 229, 230, 231.

Ethan: I 166, 169, II 165.

Eugenius IV: I 41.

Euergetes: II 233.

Eupolemus: I 27, 75. II 216.

Eusebius: I 39, 40, 74, 79, 83, 84, 91, 120.

Eve: I 117. II 244, 250.

Ewald, Heinrich: I 12, 179. II 13, 14, 27, 155, 158, 160, 181.

Ezekiel: I 23, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 64, 76, 80, 95, 105, 117, 129, 130, 160, 179, 180, 184, 189, 190, 196, 207, 208, 257, 260. II 69, 70, 81, 105, 107, 113, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 135, 136, 137, 159, 161, 202, 203, 214.

Ezra: I 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 36, 40, 44, 47, 48, 68, 77, 104, 166, 170, 174, 207, 208, 230, 246, 247, 248, 256, 262. II 22, 38, 61, 69, 70, 73, 75, 125, 161, 162, 163, 184, 205, 206, 207, 208, 210, 211, 212, 214, 215, 216, 217, 219, 220, 225, 234, 246, 247.

Ezra, 1st: I 37. II 205, 219, 220.

Ezra, 2nd: I 37. II 205, 219, 246, 247.

Ezra, 3rd: I 37, 38. II 205, 209, 219, 220.

Ezra, 4th: I 26, 27, 28, 32, 38, 39, 104, 117, 258. II 205, 247, 248.

Ezra, 5th: II 205.

- Farvardigan: II 193.  
 Feveile: II 21.  
 Fichtner: I 183. II 191, 236.  
 Field: I 86, 90.  
 Finegan: I 114. II 60, 69, 123, 127, 173.  
 Finn: II 16.  
 Firkowitch, A.: I 61.  
 Fischer, Johann: I 47.  
 Fischer, O. R.: II 128.  
 Flavian: II 246.  
 Flavius Josephus: I 108. II 241.  
 Flemming: I 244.  
 Fotheringham: II 244.  
 Frankenberg: II 240.  
 Frankfort: I 243. II 106, 177.  
 Frenssdorff: I 55, 57.  
 Freudenthal: I 75. II 241.  
 Fridrichsen: I 235.  
 Friedländer, Michael: II 203.  
 Friedrich: I 211, 232.  
 Fries, Karl: I 181.  
 Friis, Oluf: I 136.  
 Fritzsche: II 218, 240, 246, 248.  
 Frobenius: I 49. II 146.  
 Funk: I 40.  
 Fück: II 202.  
  
 Gad: II 59, 88, 212.  
 Gad, the seer: II 91.  
 Gall, von: I 67, II 125, 126.  
 Galling: I 43, 44, 46, 47, 127, 171. II 34, 60, 123, 160, 163, 180, 191, 238.  
 Gamaliel I: I 68, 171.  
 Gaster: I 113, II 180, 249.  
 Gautier: I 134.  
 Gebhardt: II 181, 240.  
 Gedaliah: II 116.  
 Geddes, Alexander: II 13.  
 Geffcken: II 242.  
 Gehman: I 44.  
 Geiger: I 69.  
 Gelasius: I 40.  
 Gemser: I 172. II 173.  
 Gennep, A. van: I 235, 243.  
 Gerhard: II 225.  
 Gerleman: I 76, 86, 101, 146. II 72, 101, 129, 154, 173, 179, 213, 216.  
 George: II 15.  
 Gesenius: I 7, 12, 46, 133, 168, 212. II 47, 103, 109, 164, 208.  
 Gideon: I 140, 237, 240. II 65, 87, 88, 90.  
 Giesebrecht: I 137. II 121.  
 Ginsburg: I 51, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 65, 70. II 205.  
 Ginsberg, H. Louis: II 191, 200, 203.  
 Glahn: I 202, II 109.  
 Glarbo, Christian: II 5.  
 Glaue: I 67.  
 Godbey, A. H.: I 168.  
 Goethe: II 57, 174, 181, 183.  
 Gog: II 124, 125.  
 Goldziher: II 207.  
 Goliath: I 140, 238, 240.  
 Goldsmith from Bazra: I 132.  
 Gomer: II 131, 132.  
 Gordon: I 48, 119, 121, 122.  
 Graf, K. H.: II 14, 15, 32, 63.  
 Gauffin: II 248.  
 Granild, S.: II 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 215, 219.  
 Granqvist, H.: I 134, 173.  
 Gray, G. B.: I 119, 120, 121. II 134, 179.  
 Grébaut: II 216.  
 Green: II 16.  
 Gregory the Great: I 41.  
 Gregory Nazianzen: I 40.  
 Gressmann: I 7, 148, 170, 171, 178, 183, 188, 193, 228, 240, 241, 243, 248, 258, 260. II 59, 74, 92, 131, 134, 167, 183, 184, 185, 218, 240.  
 Grether, O.: I 146.  
 Gronkowski, W.: II 129.  
 Grotius, Hugo: II 159 220.  
 Grundtvig: I 124.  
 Grönbeck, Vilhelm: II 103.  
 Guigues, P. E.: I 47.  
 Guillaume: I 191, 193, 194.  
 Gulin, E.: I 113, 117.  
 Gunkel, Hermann: I 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 102, 103, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 113, 115, 116, 123, 126, 141, 142, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 154, 156, 159, 161, 165, 191, 209, 229, 236, 241, 242, 243, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252. II 18, 21, 30, 31, 33,



- 37, 59, 68, 69, 134, 149, 151, 167, 183,  
184, 193, 195, 239, 240, 247.  
 Gyges: II 192.  
 Gyllenberg, R.: I 111, 149, 162. II 74, 111.  
 Habakkuk: I 36, 164, 185, 196. II 105, 129,  
151, 152, 153, 229, 230.  
 Hadassi, Juda: I 62.  
 Hadrian: I 46, 51, 89. II 242.  
 Hagar: I 237. II 48.  
 Haggai: I 36, 117, 207, 256. II 135, 137,  
153, 155, 156, 157, 160, 161, 162, 165,  
210.  
 Hahn: I 60.  
 Hakkoz: II 208.  
 Haldar: I 117, 121, 159, 184, 185, 194, 249.  
II 139, 150.  
 Halévy: II 17.  
 Haller: I 130, 131, 132, 133, 179. II 143,  
163, 180, 182, 183, 184, 186, 188, 193,  
195.  
 Hallock: I 88.  
 Hamor: II 192, 194.  
 Hamath: II 173.  
 Hammer, J. von: II 193.  
 Hammershaimb: I 134, 196, 199, 213. II 28,  
61, 108, 141, 142, 143.  
 Hammurapi: I 24, 217, 219, 228, 232, 261,  
II 56, 60.  
 Hananiah, ben Hezekiah, Rabbi: II 124.  
 Hannah: I 145, 163, 186, II 95.  
 Hansen, C. B.: I 134, 196. II 21.  
 Hannukkah: I 222, 228.  
 Happel: II 153.  
 Harald Haarfager: II 74.  
 Harder, J.M.: II 165.  
 Harford: II 16.  
 Harischandra: I 182.  
 Harnack: I 76.  
 Harris: II 240.  
 Hattusil III: I 211.  
 Hauck: II 207.  
 Haupt: II 181, 182, 193.  
 Hazar: II 84.  
 Hebert: II 153.  
 Heidenheim: I 57.  
 Helena: I 242.  
 Heliodorus: II 222, 223.  
 Heman: I 166, 169, II 165.  
 Hempel: I 14, 19, 47, 86, 104, 108, 113,  
114, 115, 122, 124, 126, 127, 128, 135,  
191, 196, 202, 206, 213, 235, 239. II 12,  
13, 41, 83, 92, 126, 168.  
 Hengstenberg: I 12, 88. II 14, 105, 135, 180.  
 Hennecke: I 264. II 238, 240, 242, 247.  
 Henoch, see Enoch.  
 Henry VIII: I 142.  
 Heraklit: II 191.  
 Herder: I 11, 12. II 108, 181.  
 Hermann: I 76, 86.  
 Hermansen, G.: I 18.  
 Hermas: I 91. II 223.  
 Herner, Sven: I 117.  
 Hertrich: II 125, 127.  
 Herod the Great: II 225, 239, 245, 250.  
 Herodotus: I 118. II 121, 192, 200.  
 Herrmann: II 54, 122, 123, 125, 237.  
 Hertz, f. Rabbi: I 29, 35, 50. II 17, 52.  
 Hertzberg: II 116, 191.  
 Hesychius: I 80, 85, 88.  
 Hetzenauer: I 93.  
 Hezekiah: I 26, 45, 56, 148, 166, 169, 207,  
212. II 68, 97, 98, 101, 104, 105, 147,  
154, 171, 172, 173, 215.  
 Hilary of Poitiers: I 41.  
 Hilgenfeld: II 246.  
 Hilkiah: II 115.  
 Hillel: I 30, 71.  
 Hinneberg: I 14.  
 Hiob: I 181.  
 Hippolytus: II 164, 195.  
 Hitzig: II 109.  
 Hobab ben Reuel: II 47.  
 Hobbes, Thomas: I 10. II 11, 13.  
 Hocart: I 235, 243.  
 Hody: I 75.  
 Hoffmann: I 52.  
 Hoffmeyer, Skat: II 238, 239, 240, 243, 245.  
 Holberg, Ludvig: II 164.  
 Holm, Søren: II 108, 115, 143.  
 Holmes: I 85.  
 Holophernes: II 226, 227.  
 Holtzmann, H. Z.: II 15.  
 Holzinger: II 29, 39, 138.

- Homer: I 78.  
 Honeyman: I 48, 114.  
 Hooght, van der: I 60.  
 Hooke: I 115, 235, 243.  
 Hoonacker, van: I 22. II 134, 207.  
 Horace: I 127.  
 Hornemann, C. F.: I 37.  
 Horst: I 232. II 141, 154.  
 Hort: I 95.  
 Hoschander: I 184. II 195.  
 Hosea: I 17, 36, 41, 95, 101, 103, 104, 117, 121, 130, 180, 195, 202, II 43, 48, 67, 73, 98, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133.  
 Hospers: II 41.  
 Hottinger: I 27.  
 Hozaj: II 212.  
 Hrozny: I 232.  
 Huldah: I 23.  
 Hulst: II 23, 44, 68.  
 Human: II 192.  
 Humbert: I 183, 185, 223. II 19, 26, 27, 30, 45, 51, 62, 149, 152, 153, 191.  
 Hupfeld: I 12, 13, 14, 57. II 13, 14, 15, 31, 45.  
 Hurwitz: I 63.  
 Hutten, Elias: I 59.  
 Hvidberg: I 22, 113, 155. II 21, 79, 138, 161, 162.  
 Hyatt: II 154.  
 Hyksos: I 171.  
 Hylander, Ivar: II 94.  
 Hylmö, Gunnar: I 14, 102, 108, 119, 120, 121, 125, 126, 139, 142, 152, 156, 159, 168, 173, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 186, 187, 188, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 207, 216, 217, 218, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 233, 234, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 247, 260.  
 Hyrcanus, Johs. II 193, 221, 237.  
 Hystaspes: I 259, 260.  
 Hügel, von: II 16.  
 Hänel: I 74.  
 Hävernicks: I 12.  
 Höeg, Carsten: I 181, 213.  
 Hölscher, G.: I 21, 22, 23, 51, 105, 120, 121, 122, 124, 172, 191, 194, 247, 248. II 18, 19, 41, 68, 69, 72, 90, 93, 98, 121, 124, 125, 127, 174, 175, 176, 177, 179, 197, 199, 208, 210, 211, 216, 220, 245, 246.  
 Ibn Ezra: I 9, 10. II 10, 11, 105, 180.  
 Ibban: II 87.  
 Iddo: II 157.  
 Ilgen, K. O.: II 13, 14, 45, 46.  
 Imlah: II 147.  
 Ingholt: I 105.  
 Innocent I: I 40.  
 Ipuwer: I 259.  
 Irenaeus: I 83, 90, 91.  
 Irwin: II 61, 63, 106, 125, 177, 179, 198, 216, 217.  
 Isaac: I 237, II 24, 36, 50.  
 Isaac, Rabbi: II 10.  
 Isaiah: I 24, 25, 32, 47, 74, 76, 80, 90, 105, 107, 117, 119, 122, 134, 179, 193, 196, 202, 237, 238, 239, 252, 256, 259. II 52, 81, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 129, 130, 137, 138, 143, 147, 148, 151, 152, 153, 154, 212, 238.  
 Ishbaal: II 94.  
 Ishmael: I 237. II 24, 48.  
 Ishtar: I 187. II 192.  
 Isidore of Seville: I 9.  
 Jablonski: I 60.  
 Jacob: I 131. II 17, 66, 231.  
 Jacob: I 236, 237, 241, 242, 243. II 21, 24, 30, 48, 49, 50, 51, 66, 71, 94, 110, 112, 143, 249.  
 Jacobsen, J. C.: I 234. II 17, 42, 53, 98, 106.  
 Jacobsen, Th.: II 177, 191.  
 Jahnnow, H.: I 146.  
 Jair: II 87.  
 Jamblichos: II 68, 201.  
 James, M.R.: II 225, 228, 248, 249, 250, 251.  
 Jansen, Ludin: I 118, 166, 171, 172, 183, 258, 260. II 244.  
 Jansma: I 72. II 160.  
 Jashar: I 145. II 84, 92, 98.  
 Jason of Cyrene: II 221, 222.  
 Jastrow: I 188.  
 Jedi: II 212.  
 Jehoash: II 136.  
 Jehoiakim: I 43, 112. II 123.  
 Jehoiada: II 136.

- Jehoiachin: II 96, 99, 119, 152, 154.  
 Jehoshaphat: II 10.  
 Jehu: I 118, 212, 244. II 130, 212.  
 Jensen, Anker: II 225.  
 Jensen, P.: II 192, 193.  
 Jensen, H.: I 47.  
 Jephthah: I 241. II 87, 90.  
 Jepsen: I 229, 262.  
 Jeremiah: I 15, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 32, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 56, 80, 94, 95, 105, 107, 112, 117, 128, 137, 145, 156, 159, 160, 164, 169, 184, 190, 192, 196, 200, 202, 204, 207, 208, 209, 212, 213, 243, 256. II 43, 61, 81, 97, 104, 105, 106, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 125, 126, 127, 128, 137, 144, 147, 150, 154, 158, 163, 178, 179, 186, 187, 190, 231, 232, 233, 248.  
 Jeroboam: II 59, 97, 149.  
 Jeroboam II: II 130, 139, 140, 144.  
 Jerome: I 9, 21, 31, 35, 39, 40, 41, 62, 66, 74, 75, 79, 83, 84, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 120. II 13, 67, 103, 129, 155, 161, 164, 165, 169, 170, 174, 184, 200, 205, 211, 224, 228, 231, 234, 235.  
 Jerubbaal: I 236, 240.  
 Jeshua: II 207.  
 Jesse: I 167, 254. II 165.  
 Jesus: I 151, 229.  
 Jether (Jetro): II 47.  
 Jezebel: I 212.  
 Jirku: I 232.  
 Joab: I 204, 212.  
 Joakim: II 226.  
 Joan of Arc: I 142.  
 Job: I 13, 26, 27, 32, 36, 40, 49, 68, 71, 75, 86, 87, 105, 110, 112, 113, 117, 118, 122, 164, 168, 169, 174, 177, 181, 182, 183, 205, 255, 256. II 28, 163, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 190, 202, 216, 217, 246, 251.  
 Joel: I 36, 164. II 122, 129, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 142, 159.  
 Johanan (or Jonathan): II 207.  
 Johannesen, Egon: I 22, 26, 170, 248. II 38, 39, 69, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 219, 220.  
 Johannsen, Hinrich: I 126, 129, 132. II 7.  
 John: I 90, 260. II 107, 135, 159, 197, 247.  
 John of Damascus: II 10.  
 Johnson, A. C.: I 44.  
 Johnson, A. R.: I 159, 167, 184, 194, 249. II 103, 170.  
 Jonah: I 36, 163, 239, 241, 264. II 127, 129, 144, 145, 146, 168, 184, 185, 224.  
 Jonathan: I 70, 71, 91, 111, 112, 135, 136, 137. II 155.  
 Jonathan ben Uzziel: I 71.  
 Joseph: I 114, 185, 236, 237, 240, 241. II 12, 21, 25, 31, 46, 48, 50, 58, 82, 184.  
 Joseph, Rabbi: I 71.  
 Josephus: I 20, 26, 27, 28, 32, 35, 36, 39, 73, 75, 77, 79, 82, 108, 120. II 10, 52, 72, 124, 125, 129, 199, 205, 209, 219, 220, 223, 231, 233, 241, 251.  
 Joshua: I 25, 26, 34, 71, 208, 248, 249, 263. II 9, 14, 18, 19, 23, 26, 29, 30, 31, 35, 40, 47, 73, 74, 75, 77, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 94, 96, 101, 111, 112, 130, 147, 156, 158, 162, 244.  
 Josiah: I 23, 106, 145, 207, 211, 230, 231. II 13, 15, 19, 67, 68, 75, 83, 84, 97, 99, 116, 123, 136, 152, 154, 159, 187, 214, 215.  
 Jotham: I 179, 206, 244. II 90, 99, 147.  
 Judah: I 30, 144. II 46, 48, 58, 83, 88, 249.  
 Judah the Maccabee: I 210. II 222.  
 Judith: I 37, 38, 39, 40, 238, 240, 241, 247, 264. II 60, 184, 224, 226, 227, 228, 231.  
 Junilius Africanus: I 9.  
 Justinus Martyr: I 77. II 103.  
 Justinian: I 89.  
 Jülicher, Ad.: I 87, 92. II 15, 32.  
 Kahle, P.: I 5, 7, 36, 37, 38, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 120, 121, 122, 266. II 52, 72, 115, 220, 234.  
 Kalt: II 180.  
 Kamil, Murad: II 209.  
 Kaminka: II 105.  
 Kamphausen, I 12. II 197.  
 Kapelrud, A.: I 22, 159, 170, 232, 243, 248. II 27, 29, 125, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 142, 192.  
 Karlstadt: I 10. II 11.



- Kase, E. H.: I 44.  
 Katten: I 68.  
 Katz, P.: I 37, 83.  
 Kaufmann: II 21, 60, 64.  
 Kautzsch, E.: I 7, 22, 41, 55, 124, 247. II 39,  
     51, 164, 210, 211, 216, 218, 220, 232,  
     233, 234, 238, 240, 241, 244, 247, 249,  
     250.  
 Keble, John: I 77.  
 Kees: I 170, 171, 172, 176.  
 Keil: I 12, 18.  
 Kennedy, J.: I 95, 98.  
 Kennicott: I 50, 51, 60.  
 Kenyon, F. G.: I 44, 80, 82, 86, 91. II 204.  
 Kierkegaard: II 50, 189.  
 Kimchi: I 60.  
 Kisch: II 248.  
 Kissane: II 115.  
 Kittel, G.: II 240.  
 Kittel, Rud.: I 7, 52, 54, 55, 60, 76, 98,  
     213. II 187.  
 Kleinert: II 191.  
 Klostermann: I 79. II 17, 37, 71, 123, 207.  
 Knobel: I 12. II 14.  
 Knudtzon: I 187, 213.  
 Koch: II 21.  
 Kohn: I 67.  
 Kolbe: II 221, 222.  
 Korah: I 166, 254. II 165.  
 Koschaker: I 232.  
 Kusters: I 15, 211.  
 Kraetzschmar: II 124.  
 Krohn: I 234.  
 Kroll: II 72.  
 Kräutlein: II 30.  
 Kuenen: I 12, 13, 27, 67, 214. II 15, 16,  
     28, 48, 100, 109, 129, 136, 203.  
 Kugler: II 208.  
 Kuhl: I 166. II 229.  
 Kuhn: I 128. II 173, 180, 191, 234, 240, 246.  
 Kuhnert: I 43.  
 Kulp: II 153.  
 Kuchler: I 159, 191.  
 Köhler, L.: I 202. II 109.  
 König, E.: II 109, 136.  
 König, F.W.: II 122.  
     80, 83, 84, 85, 93. II 193, 197.  
 Lagrange: I 35, 87. II 217, 218, 239,  
     247.  
 Lamech: I 140.  
 Lanchester: II 134.  
 Langhe, De: I 118, 171.  
 Langton, Stephen: I 48.  
 Lattey, C.: II 170, 245.  
 Lauha, Aarre: II 122, 134.  
 Leander: I 50, 54, 55, 57, 63. II 168.  
 Lee: I 73.  
 Leeuw, van der: II 77.  
 Lehmann, Edv.: I 137.  
 Lemuel: I 169. II 171, 172.  
 Lessing: II 13.  
 Leusden: I 27, 60.  
 Leeuw, G. van der: I 243.  
 Levi: I 215, 237. II 58, 59, 88, 151, 229,  
     237, 249.  
 Levison, N.: I 95.  
 Levita, Elias: I 27.  
 Levy, F. A.: II 17.  
 Lévy, I.: II 95, 193.  
 Lévy-Bruhl, I 235, 243.  
 Lewis, Alkin I 43.  
 Lewy, H.: II 196.  
 Lewy, L.: II 228.  
 Ley: I 120.  
 Liebermann: I 89. II 233.  
 Lidzbarski: I 47.  
 Lie: I 232.  
 Liestöl: I 234.  
 Lietzmann: I 48, 221. II 218, 240, 246.  
 Lightfoot: I 95.  
 Liljeblad: II 225.  
 Lindblom: I 13, 21, 47, 105, 108, 118, 122,  
     168, 181, 182, 191, 192, 194, 195, 202,  
     204, 205, 209, 243, 248. II 23, 26, 94,  
     107, 108, 114, 115, 121, 133, 143, 149,  
     153, 174, 179, 197, 240.  
 Lindhagen: II 115.  
 Littmann: I 88.  
 Lods, Ad.: I 194. II 12.  
 Loisy: I 22.  
 Lot: I 238. II 60.  
 Lowth: I 11, 119.  
 Lucian: I 79, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91.  
 Luis de Leon: II 180.  
 Lund, E.: I 122.  
 Luther, B.: I 251.  
 Luther: I 9, 10, 21, 39, 49, 58, 192, 222. II 52,

Laban: II 51.

Lactantius: II 240.

Lagarde, Paul de: I 50, 51, 54, 71, 72, 74,

- 54, 122, 133, 174, 179, 186, 194, 224, 231, 232.  
 Luzzatto, S. D.: I 70.  
 Lüdtke: II 249.  
 Löfgren: II 129, 205.  
 Löhr: II 17, 38, 92.  
 Maag, V: II, 143.  
 Maccabees: I 37, 38, 39, 40, 41. II 190, 193, 199, 203, 204, 216, 221, 222, 223, 228, 239, 241, 243, 245, 249.  
 Madsen, II 216.  
 Mahlon: II 182.  
 Mahol: I 169.  
 Maimonides: I 64.  
 Malachi: I 36, 117, 181, 200, 256, 259. II 67, 69, 70, 129, 133, 138, 142, 143, 155, 158, 160, 161.  
 Malamat, A.: II 117, 159.  
 Malinowski: I 235, 243.  
 Manasseh: I 38, 56, 166. II 88, 103, 148, 149, 214, 228, 229, 238.  
 Mangenot: II 16.  
 Manson, T. W.: I 91.  
 Marcion: I 91, II 252.  
 Marcus: II 234.  
 Mardocai: II 192, 193, 229, 231.  
 Marduk: I 188. II 192.  
 Marti: I 96, 128. II 129, 132, 133, 145, 151, 152, 155.  
 Marx, G. A.: I 27, see Dalman.  
 Mary: I 240.  
 Mashti: II 192.  
 Masius: II 11.  
 Mathias Flacius Illyricus: I 62.  
 Mat'ilu: I 211.  
 Matouš, L.: I 212.  
 Mattathias: II 245.  
 Matthews, J. G.: II 128.  
 Mede: II 159.  
 Meier, J.: I 234.  
 Me'ir (Abulafia) ha-Levi ben Todros: I 57.  
 Me'ir: I 91.  
 Meinhold: I 183.  
 Meissner: I 44, 45, 106, 119, 171, 215. II 131.  
 Melchizedek: I 188, 238. II 60.  
 Melito of Sardis: I 30, 40. II 129.  
 Mensching: I 21, 23.  
 Mercer: II 191.  
 Merx: II 15, 134, 136.  
 Mesha: I 45. II 59.  
 Meshullak: I 211.  
 Meshullam, b Zaccur: I 211.  
 Messel: I 16, 103, 236, 245. II 28, 51, 107, 125, 244.  
 Mercati: I 79, 84, 90.  
 Mez, A.: I 79.  
 Meyer, Carl: II 228.  
 Meyer, C. F.: I 55.  
 Meyer, Ed.: I 251, 260. II 68, 74, 82, 208, 211, 240.  
 Meyer, W.: II 250.  
 Michael: II 244.  
 Micah: I 36, 41, 117, 202. II 129, 135, 147, 148, 149.  
 Micaiah ben Imlah: I 194.  
 Michaelis, J. D.: I 9, 98.  
 Michaelis, J. H.: I 60.  
 Michelet: I 16, 103, 236, 245. II 28, 51, 89, 107, 125, 143.  
 Miles: I 232.  
 Miriam: I 141.  
 Misch: I 248.  
 Mitchell: II 155, 156.  
 Moab: I 142, 145.  
 Moffat: I 148.  
 Montanus, Arias: I 49, 59.  
 Montefiore: II 252.  
 Montgomery: I 91. II 101, 139, 205.  
 Moore: I 20, 21, 27, 29, 30, 31, 192. II 218.  
 Morbeck: I 202.  
 Mordecai: I 31. II 192.  
 Morinus: I 10.  
 Mosbech: I 28, 37, 249, 260. II 21, 197, 234, 243.  
 Mose ben Asher: I 54.  
 Mose hanakdan: I 57.  
 Moses: I 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 56, 75, 77, 81, 82, 108, 112, 120, 125, 142, 160, 167, 169, 204, 207, 208, 209, 215, 217, 218, 230, 237, 240, 248, 264. II 10, 11, 12, 16, 20, 21, 23, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 40, 43, 47, 49, 50, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 66, 68, 71, 72, 73, 74, 77, 82, 94, 96, 105, 111, 112, 113, 122, 124, 138, 161, 163, 165, 172, 174, 201, 202, 208, 215, 216, 217, 237, 244, 245, 246, 250.

- Moses ben Moshe: I 64.  
 Moses from Amsterdam: I 59.
- 1-1-I Mowinckel: I 16, 22, 25, 93, 103, 106, 112, 113, 115, 118, 121, 125, 130, 133, 137, 141, 143, 145, 146, 149, 150, 153, 154, 156, 159, 161, 165, 166, 167, 169, 172, 174, 184, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 202, 212, 214, 232, 236, 245, 247, 248, 253, 259, 260. II 19, 24, 28, 30, 37, 41, 42, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 78, 83, 84, 85, 89, 94, 98, 103, 107, 108, 112, 114, 115, 120, 121, 125, 136, 140, 141, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 167, 168, 169, 170, 179, 182, 195, 207, 209, 210, 211, 230.
- Muhammed: I 70.
- Mundle: II 247.
- 64-I-18 Murtonen, II 139.
- Möhle: I 90.
- Möhlenbrink: II 23, 74, 83, 85, 160.
- Möller: II 16.
- Müller, Johs.: II 224.
- Nabonidus: II 196, 197.
- Nabopalassar: II 149.
- Nabu: I 172.
- Nahum: I 36, 117, 121, 138, 196. II 129, 149, 150, 151, 152.
- Naomi: I 182, 184.
- Naphthali: II 249.
- 264-2-I Nash: I 47, 61. II 52.
- Nathan: I 160, 165, 179, 187, 194. II 91, 92, 174, 212.
- Natronai: I 62.
- Naumann: II 233.
- Nebat: II 97, 149.
- Nebuchadnezzar: I 47, 178, 213, 238. II 117, 122, 192, 195, 196, 201, 204, 226, 228, 232.
- Necho: II 153, 214.
- Neferrehu: I 259.
- Nehemiah: I 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 36, 40, 48, 68, 118, 148, 170, 246, 247, 248, 262. II 22, 38, 61, 67, 69, 72, 73, 136, 162, 163, 184, 193, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 214, 215, 216, 217, 219.
- Neile, Mc.: I 90.
- Nero: II 242.
- Nestle: II 57, 144.
- Neubauer, A.: I 65. II 234.
- Newton: II 200.
- Nicanor: II 193, 222.
- Nicolaus de Lyra: I 9, 41.
- Nielsen, E.: I, 108, 122, 251.
- Niese: II 221, 222.
- Noah: I 211, 237, 260. II 24, 26, 31, 32, 37, 66, 174, 175, 202, 241, 243.
- Norden: I 241.
- North, C. R.: I 105, 264. II 24, 27, 46, 62, 80, 105, 110, 113.
- Noth, M.: I 24, 95, 139, 143, 144, 161, 194, 212, 224, 228, 229, 230, 231, 235, 246, 249, 251, 262, 263. II 9, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 31, 40, 73, 75, 76, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 91, 92, 147, 151, 154, 155, 174, 207, 212, 215, 216.
- Novaković: II 244, 249.
- Nowack: II 19, 40, 176.
- Nyberg, H. S.: I 17, 95, 96, 102, 103, 105, 108, 121, 195, 235. II 20, 26, 58, 60, 108, 111, 112, 119, 131, 132, 173, 225.
- Nygren, A.: II 151, 153.
- Nyström, S.: I 118.
- Nöldeke: I 72. II 15, 45, 70, 129, 151, 190.
- Obadiah: I 36. II 117, 129, 143, 144, 155.
- Odeberg: II 191, 242.
- Oesterley: I 19, 34, 39, 40, 41, 50, 51, 125, 149. II 22, 67, 90, 91, 92, 147, 167, 170, 173, 218, 219, 223, 225, 228, 229, 230, 234, 235, 236, 247.
- Oestreicher: II 19.
- Og: I 235.
- Olinder: I 175.
- Olrik: I. 233, 234, 242.
- Olshausen: I 12, 50.
- Omri: I 44.
- Onias: II 222, 233.
- Onkelos: I 59, 69, 70, 72, 83, 90.
- Opitz: I 60, 86.
- Orelli: II 123.
- Origen: I 21, 35, 39, 73, 75, 77, 78, 79, 83, 84, 86, 90, 92, 120. II 9, 10, 86, 164, 181, 204, 205, 230, 238, 248.
- Orpha: II 182, 184.
- Othniel: II 87.
- Ottley: I 37, 86.
- Otto: I 187.



- Palladius, Petrus: I 10.  
 Pamphilus: I 79.  
 Parsons: I 85.  
 Paton: II 195, 231.  
 Patton: II 167.  
 Paul: I 38, 68, 90, 171, 172, 191, 207. II 155, 208, 235.  
 Paul of Tella: I 79, 89. II 204.  
 Pauly: II 72.  
 Pedersen, Johs.: I 16, 22, 108, 113, 118, 138, 140, 141, 163, 168, 184, 194, 197, 204, 218, 228, 232, 250. II 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 33, 60, 62, 63, 66, 68, 70, 78, 80, 86, 103, 108, 131, 161, 176, 179, 191, 244, 249.  
 Pedersen, Niels: I 121.  
 Pelatiah: II 127.  
 Pereira, B.: II 11, 129, 179, 195, 211.  
 Petermann: I 67.  
 Peters: II 183, 234.  
 Pethuel: II 133.  
 Pfeiffer: I 17, 19, 22, 247. II 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 28, 34, 36, 37, 41, 45, 48, 49, 53, 57, 60, 68, 69, 80, 85, 87, 89, 90, 92, 95, 98, 99, 100, 101, 107, 108, 110, 116, 117, 118, 119, 124, 127, 128, 132, 135, 136, 140, 143, 144, 148, 150, 157, 159, 161, 162, 164, 169, 170, 171, 175, 176, 177, 178, 183, 184, 188, 190, 193, 194, 203, 205, 212, 213, 225.  
 Pfeleiderer: II 191.  
 Pharos: I 81.  
 Philip II of Spain: I 59.  
 Philo: I 20, 36, 37, 75, 76, 77, 81, 82, 120. II 10, 52, 86, 217, 235, 248, 251.  
 Philocrates: II 236.  
 Philodectus: I 81.  
 Phinchas: II 82.  
 Photius: I 41.  
 Pieper, Max: I 119.  
 Pius XI: I 93.  
 Pius XII: I 13.  
 Plantin: I 59.  
 Platon: I 84, 142, 181.  
 Plum: II 21.  
 Podechard: II 191.  
 Polybius: II 200.  
 Pompey: II 239.  
 Porphyry: II 200.  
 Porteous: I 118.  
 Potiphar: I 241.  
 Pratensis, Felix: I 55, 58.  
 Praxiteles: I 135.  
 Press: II 160.  
 Preuschen: II 249.  
 Pritchard: I 114, 232.  
 Procksch: I 43, 127, 233, 251. II 48.  
 Procopius of Gaza: II 13.  
 Prätorius: I 71.  
 Pseudo-Phocylides: II 251.  
 Ptolemies: II 236.  
 Ptolemy II Philadelphus: I 75. II 236.  
 Ptolemy III: II 164.  
 Ptolemy IV Philopator: I 75. II 223.  
 Ptolemy V: II 190.  
 Ptolemy Physcon VII Euergetes: II 223, 233, 241.  
 Ptolemy VIII: II 231.  
 Ptolemy XIV: II 231.  
 Pusey: I 12. II 14, 201.  
 Puukko: II 26.  
 Pythia: I 192.  
 Quell: II 170.  
 Rad, G. von: I 24, 229, 249, 263. II 12, 19, 21, 24, 27, 32, 33, 44, 60, 74, 75, 76, 85, 215.  
 Radermacher: II 146, 244.  
 Raguel: II 224.  
 Rahab: II 85.  
 Rahlfs: I 67, 77, 78, 84, 85, 90, 145. II 165, 205, 218, 223, 228.  
 Ramses III: I 114.  
 Rankin: I 183.  
 Ranston: I 183. II 191.  
 Raphael: II 222.  
 Raphael, Angel: II 224, 225.  
 Rashi: I 9.  
 Rayner, F. A.: II 147.  
 Rebecca: II 24.  
 Reicke, Bo: I 241.  
 Reifenberg, A.: I 48.  
 Renan: II 181.  
 Rendel Harris: II 240.  
 Reuben: II 46, 48, 58.  
 Reuchlin: I 55, 65, 71.  
 Reuel: II 47.

- Reuss: I 14, 17, 142. II 15, 16, 131, 181, 227.  
 Riesefeld, H.: II 107.  
 Riessler: II 218.  
 Rignell, K. G.: II, 160.  
 Ringgren: I 108, 175, 183, 232. II 21, 61, 79.  
 Roberts, C. H.: I 86.  
 Robertson Smith: I 13, 21, 103, 106.  
 Robinson: I 196, 199. II 22, 67, 90, 91, 92, 122, 135, 144, 145, 147, 148, 168.  
 Robinson, T. H.: I 122. II 167, 179.  
 Robinson, Wheeler: I 19, 23, 50, 51, 108, 168, 170, 172, 174, 175, 232. II 102, 129, 130, 132, 133, 139.  
 Rodhe, Sten: I 149.  
 Roller: I 213.  
 Ronzevalle: I 47.  
 Rosenmüller: I 50.  
 Rossi, de: I 50, 51.  
 Rost: I 19, 102, 244. II 18, 92, 94.  
 Rothstein: I 121, 212. II 72, 156, 157, 160, 216.  
 Rowley, H. H.: I 5, 139, 159, 183, 185, 191, 194, 218, 260. II 5, 19, 24, 55, 91, 107, 115, 122, 134, 135, 136, 139, 143, 160, 179, 186, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 207, 208, 211, 216, 218, 238, 240, 242, 243, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251.  
 Rudolph: I 210, 263. II 19, 26, 29, 45, 46, 74, 84, 85, 90, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 144, 163, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188.  
 Rufinus: I 41.  
 Ruth: I 26, 32, 36, 39, 40, 74, 210, 240, 241, 247, 264. II 163, 182, 184, 186, 187, 216.  
 Ryge Jensen: I 96.  
 Rylaarsdam, J. Coert.: II 218.  
 Ryssel: II 70, 234.  
 Rzach: II 242.  
 Rönsch: I 87. II 238.  
 Rordam: I 10.  
 Sa'adya, Gaon: I 67, 72, 88.  
 Sabatier: I 87.  
 Samson: I 128, 141, 178, 208, 235. II 87, 88, 89.  
 Samuel: I 25, 26, 36, 40, 48, 79, 95, 101, 192, 193, 233, 239, 248, 249, 250, 257, 262, 263. II 18, 64, 65, 81, 82, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 101, 211, 212.  
 Samuel, Rabbi: I 30.  
 Sanders: I 80.  
 Sarah: II 24, 36, 224.  
 Sargon, I 105. II 148.  
 Saul: I 111, 112, 135, 168, 229, 237, 244. II 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 211.  
 Schaefer: I 86, 170, 222. II 200, 207, 209, 211.  
 Schaeffer, Claude F. A.: I 106, 118, 171.  
 Schechter: I 53. II 234.  
 Scheffelowitz, II 192.  
 Scheide: I 44.  
 Scheil: I 232.  
 Schiller: I 142.  
 Schlatter, Ad.: I 126, 132. II 221.  
 Schleiermacher: I 12.  
 Schmidt, A. M.: II 127.  
 Schmidt, Carl: I 80. II 240.  
 Schmidt, E.: II 183.  
 Schmidt, Hans: I 158, 159, 248. II 133, 145, 146, 160.  
 Scholem, G. S.: II 242.  
 Scholz: II 228, 230, 231.  
 Schrader: I 12. II 14, 16, 192.  
 Schwally: II 121.  
 Schwartz: I 84.  
 Schürer: I 34, 35, 70, 74, 75. II 216, 218.  
 Scott, R. B. Y.: I 185.  
 Seierstad, I.: I 191.  
 Seinecke: II 125.  
 Seleucus IV: II 222.  
 Sellers, O. R.: II 170.  
 Sellin: I 19, 96, 102. II 54, 83, 96, 112, 123, 131, 133, 144, 151, 160, 163, 179, 188, 191, 216.  
 Semler: I 11, 55.  
 Sennacherib: I 148, 166, 212. II 101, 104, 105, 148.  
 Seth: II 24, 71.  
 Severus: I 91.  
 Shakespeare: I 142.  
 Shamash: I 24.  
 Shamgar: II 87.  
 Shammai: I 30.  
 Shaphan: I 171.  
 Shavsha: I 171.  
 Shelomo ben Buya'a: I 54.  
 Shemaiah: I 213.  
 Sibyllines: I 259. II 198, 199, 241, 242.

- Siegfried: I 37. II 191.  
 Sievers: I 65, 94, 120, 121, 122, 233.  
 Sihon: I 145.  
 Silverstone: I 90.  
 Simeon: I 237. II 58, 88.  
 Simon: I 187. II 233.  
 Simon benMenasya: I 30.  
 Simon theMaccabee. I 148. II 221.  
 Simon Magus: I 172.  
 Simon, Richard: I 10, 11, 17, 62. II 11, 12.  
 Simonsen, D.: I 57.  
 Simpson, C. A.: II 19.  
 Simpson, D. C.: I 114. II 80, 167, 225.  
 Simrock: II 225.  
 Sinuhe: I 246.  
 Siracid: I 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 80, 113, 169, 170, 171, 172, 177, 182, 255. II 10, 166, 172, 199, 233, 234.  
 Sixtus V: I 92.  
 Sjöberg: I 201, 202. II 106, 244.  
 Skinner: I 194, 250, 251. II 17, 27, 116.  
 Skjot-Petersen, I 262.  
 Smalley, B.: I 9.  
 Smend: I 165. II 16, 18, 19, 48, 124, 211, 234.  
 Smith, G. A.: I 125, 146. II 146.  
 Smith, J.: II 125.  
 Smith, Powis: I 232, 262. II 154.  
 Smith, Sidney: II 115.  
 Snaith: II 81, 106, 169, 216.  
 Solomo Jedidia mi-Norzi: I 57, 60.  
 Solomon: I 11, 30, 36, 37, 73, 110, 112, 128, 129, 146, 165, 166, 169, 170, 171, 172, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179, 206, 209, 211, 215, 230, 241, 243, 245, 255, 263. II 34, 49, 58, 68, 84, 89, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 115, 156, 163, 165, 171, 172, 179, 180, 188, 189, 190, 191, 211, 232, 234, 235, 236, 239, 240.  
 Sommer: I 50.  
 Sperber, Alexander: I 83. II 41.  
 Spiegelberg: I 259.  
 Spinoza: I 10, 11. II 11, 200.  
 Spiro, I 101. II 216, 248.  
 Springer: I 135.  
 Stade: I 65. II 121, 159.  
 Stamm, J. J.: I 182. II 174.  
 Stanley: I 12. II 201.  
 Staples, W. E.: II 184.  
 Stave: I 13, 21. II 16, 123.  
 Stegmüller: I 82.  
 Steinmann: I 237, 260. II 204, 205.  
 Stella: II 192.  
 Stenzel, M.: II 154.  
 Stephan, St. H.: I 129.  
 Stephanus, Robert: I 48.  
 Stephen: I 56.  
 Stevenson: II 179.  
 Steuernagel: I 21, 25, 27, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41, 48, 50, 51, 57, 60, 61, 69, 71, 74, 76, 79, 86, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 95, 98, 99, 101. II 19, 29, 35, 37, 40, 41, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 71, 85, 164, 175, 176, 177, 194, 205, 230, 231.  
 Stevns, Magnus: I 124.  
 Stier, R.: I 59.  
 Stocks: II 134.  
 Stollberg: II 146.  
 Strack: I 51, 52, 57, 65. II 144, 234.  
 Ström, Åke V.: I 147, 165. II 103.  
 Stummer: I 93, 116, 159. II 83, 92, 227.  
 Stähelin: I 12. II 13, 218.  
 Sulammith: II 182.  
 Susanna: I 37. II 225, 229, 230, 231.  
 Swete: I 37, 73, 85. II 205, 218, 244.  
 Sydow, von: I 234.  
 Symmachus: I 51, 56, 78, 82, 90, 91, 266. II 169.  
 Söderblom, N.: I 20, 115. II 181, 249.  
 Sœc, N. H.: II 108, 115.  
 Tabeel: II 207, 210.  
 Tallqvist: I 117.  
 Tantalus: I 256.  
 Tarn: I 75, 81.  
 Tatian: II 61.  
 Taxo: II 245.  
 Taylor: I 53, 90, 166.  
 Tedesche: II 220.  
 Tegnér, Esaias, jun.: I 119.  
 Teicher: I 54, 55, 68.  
 Théodoret: II 200.  
 Tertullian: I 91. II 103.  
 Thackeray, H. St. John: I 76, 85, 86. II 232, 233.  
 Theile, K. G. W.: I 59.  
 Thenius: II 92.



- Theocritus: II 181.  
 Theodore of Mopsuestia: I 40, 73, 181. II 180.  
 181.  
 Theodotion, I 51, 56, 70, 71, 76, 78, 80,  
 82, 90, 91, 266. II 151, 169, 204, 229,  
 230, 231.  
 Theopompus: I 81.  
 Thiele: II 09.  
 Thomas Ag.: I 41.  
 Thomas of Celano: II 154.  
 Thomas, Winton: I 45, 47, 54, 68, 72, 74,  
 85, 213 II 116.  
 Thoma: I 131.  
 Thoth: I 172.  
 Tiele: I 20.  
 Timotheus of Alexandria: I 27.  
 Tischendorf: II 250.  
 Titus: II 188.  
 Tobit: I 37, 38, 39, 40, 241, 247, 264.  
 II 223, 224, 225, 227, 228.  
 Tola: II 87.  
 Torczyner: I 43, 45, 47, 99, 213. II  
 171.  
 Torm: I 21. II 68, 197.  
 Torrey: I 19, 21, 22 39, 41. II 109, 123, 125,  
 127, 160, 209, 210, 211, 215, 218, 219,  
 220, 227, 236, 244, 245, 247, 251.  
 Trito-Isaiah: II 104, 109, 110, 114, 118.  
 Tuch: II 14.  
 Tur-Sinai: I, 178. (= Torczyner).  
 Ugarit: I 106.  
 Ulfila: I 89.  
 Uriah: I 212.  
 Uriel Acosta: II 200.  
 Uzziah: II 99, 103, 139.  
 Vaschalde: I 88.  
 Vashti: II 192.  
 Vater, J. S.: II 13, 27.  
 Vatke: I 12. II 15, 16, 136.  
 Vaux, de: I 248. II 98.  
 Violet: II 247, 248.  
 Virolleaud: I 106. II 202, 230.  
 Vischer, W.: II 73, 194, 195.  
 Vollers: I 67.  
 Volten: I 183.  
 Volz: II 19, 45, 46, 83, 92, 117, 121, 132.  
 Vööbus, A.: I 74.  
 Vriczen, Th. C.: I 98. II 26, 41, 92, 94,  
 133, 185.  
 Wade: II 134.  
 Walafrid, Strabo: I 41.  
 Walton, Brian: I 59, 62.  
 Walzel: I 14.  
 Waterman: I 262. II 182.  
 Watzinger: I 123.  
 Weber: I 211.  
 Weidner: I 211. II 123.  
 Weincl: II 247.  
 Weiser: I 17, 19, 80, 102, 108, 149, 151, 172,  
 176, 245. II 143, 170.  
 Welch: I 184. II 19, 22, 38, 116.  
 Wellhausen: I 12, 13, 72, 95, 220. II 15,  
 16, 18, 21, 32, 35, 37, 39, 41, 45, 61,  
 63, 64, 66, 67, 74, 82, 92, 95, 131, 133,  
 141, 142, 143, 145, 202, 211, 216,  
 221, 222, 240, 247.  
 Wen-Amon: I 44, 106, 194, 245, 246.  
 Wendel: I 209. II 47.  
 Wendland: I 75, 83, 181, 213. II 237.  
 Westcott: I 95.  
 Westphal: II 16, 29.  
 Wetzstein: I 129. II 181.  
 Wevers: I 86.  
 Wickes: I 54.  
 Widengren: I 100, 105, 111, 115, 116, 118,  
 133, 159, 235, 243. II 79, 103, 181, 228,  
 249.  
 Wiegand: I 123.  
 Wiener, H.M.: II 17, 27.  
 Wildeboer: I 14, 128. II 100, 171.  
 Willoughby: I 16, 17, 19, 52, 54, 61, 63,  
 84, 170, 218.  
 Willrich: I 213. II 193, 223, 237.  
 Wilson: II 106, 177.  
 Winckler: II 193, 241.  
 Windisch: I 260.  
 Winnett: II 19.  
 Wissowa: II 72.  
 Witter, H. B.: II 12, 27.  
 Wolfsohn: I 71.  
 Wright, W.: I 65.  
 Wright, G. E.: II 16, 54, 69, 84.  
 Wright, J. S.: II 211.  
 Wutz: I 66, 74, 86.

- Xenophon: I 142.  
 Xerxes: II 114, 174, 192, 193, 198, 207.  
 Ximenes, F.: I 59.  
 Ya'uhan: I 211.  
 Young, Edw. J.: I 18, 19. II 16, 205.  
 Zabud: II 92.  
 Zarathustra: I 218.  
 Zechariah: I 36, 117, 180, 184, 208, 256.  
     II 129, 135, 153, 155, 156, 157, 159,  
     160, 161, 165, 204, 207, 210.  
 Zedekiah: I 112, 136, 180.  
 Zeitlin: II 238.  
 Zephaniah: I 36. II 105, 122, 129, 137, 151,  
     153, 154.  
 Zerubbabel: II 70, 72, 128, 146, 156, 158,  
     160, 207, 208, 215, 219, 220.  
 Zeus: I 185.  
 Ziegler: I 19.  
 Zimmermann: II 203.  
 Zimmern: I 214, 232. II. 192, 193.  
 Zophar: II 174, 177.  
 Zsiros: I 146.  
 Zunz: II 125.  
 Östborn: I 21, 22, 23, 24, 189, 213, 214,  
     216, 232.

## QUOTATIONS

- Genesis* 1: I 29, 152. II 26,  
 28, 35, 37, 61.  
 1-2: I 242.  
 1-11: II 51.  
 1,1: I 56, 77.  
 1,2: I 195.  
 1,24: I 66.  
 1,26ff.: II 36.  
 1,27: I 91.  
 1,28: I 134.  
 2: II 145.  
 2-3: I 241. II 61.  
 2,2: II 36.  
 2,3: II 53.  
 3: I 241, 204.  
 3,22: II 49.  
 4: I 237. II 62.  
 4,4: I 134, 186.  
 4,23: I 140.  
 4,25: II 24.  
 4,26: II 25, 28, 45, 71.  
 5: I 66.  
 5,1: II 33.  
 5,1ff.: II 24, 36.  
 5,21: II 242.  
 5,24: II 35.  
 6-9: I 253.  
 6,1-4: II 237.  
 6,6f.: II 49.  
 6,9: II 33, 35.  
 6,19: II 24.  
 7,2: II 24, 31.  
 8,21: II 49.  
 9: I 211, 237. II 37.  
 9,6: I 223, 224. II 36.  
 9,9ff.: I 210.  
 9,25: I 141.  
 10: I 237.  
 10,1: II 33.  
 10,9: I 168.  
 11: I 237.  
 11,6ff.: II 49.  
 11,10: II 33.  
 11,10ff.: I 66.  
 11,27: II 33.  
 11,31: II 24.  
 12: II 48, 51.  
 12,1: II 24.  
 12,1ff.: I 141.  
 12,1-3: II 21.  
 12,2: I 134.  
 12,6: I 185.  
 12,6: II 11.  
 12,6f.: I 236.  
 12,10ff.: II 27, 30.  
 12,6-8+13,2,5,7-11a: II 60  
 12,12b-13: II 60.  
 13,6: II 35.  
 13,7: II 11.  
 14: I 237, 238. II 59, 60.  
 14,1: II 60.  
 14,7: I 214.  
 14,9f.: I 141.  
 14,14: II 11.  
 14,18-20: II 60.  
 14,19-20: I 188.  
 15: II 51.  
 15,1: II 50.  
 15,2: II 60.  
 15,7: II 28.  
 15,9-18: I 210.  
 15,11: I 185.  
 15,17: II 25, 49.  
 16: I 237. II 48.  
 16,4-14: II 30.  
 16,7ff.: II 49.  
 16,11: I 134, 186.  
 16,11ff.: I 134.  
 16,14: I 235.  
 16,16: II 24.  
 17: I 211. II 28, 37, 62.  
 17,1: I 187. II 28, 35.  
 17,4ff.: I 210.  
 17,16ff.: II 36.  
 18: I 236. II 36.  
 18-19: II 60.  
 18,1ff.: I 236.  
 18,6: I 101.  
 18,11: II 24,26.  
 18,22b-33: II 64.  
 18,30: I 57.  
 19: II 50.  
 19,1ff.: II 49.  
 19,30ff.: II 182.  
 20: II 27, 48, 50.  
 20,1: II 51.  
 20,1ff.: II 30.  
 20,12: II 51.  
 20,13: I 69. II 66.  
 21: I 237. II 48.  
 21,5ff.: II 51.  
 21,8-21: II 30.  
 21,21: I 70.  
 21,22-32: I 209.  
 22: I 222, 237, 241. II 50.  
 22,8: I 236.  
 22,11: II 30.  
 22,12: I 236.



22,14: I 236. II 11.  
 22,16ff.: I 141.  
 23: II 37.  
 23,5-6: II 24.  
 23,6: II 56.  
 23,16-17: I 210.  
 24: I 56.  
 24-33: I 241.  
 24,7: II 49.  
 24,27: I 151.  
 24,60: I 129, 133, 139.  
 25: II 183, 184.  
 25,1: II 25, 26.  
 25,9: II 35.  
 25,12: II 33.  
 25,14: I 169.  
 25,19: II 33.  
 25,23: I 134, 186.  
 25,29ff.: I 237.  
 25,32: I 233.  
 26: II 51.  
 26,1ff.: II 27.  
 26,24: I 187, II 49, 112.  
 26,26-31: I 209.  
 26,34: II 227.  
 27: I 237.  
 27,13: I 69.  
 27,27ff.: I 141.  
 27,39ff.: I 141.  
 28: II 24.  
 28,1: II 35.  
 28,3: II 28.  
 28,10-12: II 30.  
 28,11ff.: I 186.  
 28,13: I 187. II 30.  
 28,13ff.: I 141. II 49.  
 28,17-18: II 30.  
 28,18: II 43, 50.  
 28,18ff.: I 236.  
 28,19: I 236.  
 28,20-22: II 30.  
 29,27-28: I 128.  
 29,31-30,24: I 134.  
 30,28-34: I 210.  
 30,29-43: II 30.  
 30,37ff.: II 51.  
 31,4-16: II 30.

31,19: II 50.  
 31,27: I 124.  
 31,44ff.: I 210.  
 31,44-54: I 209.  
 31,47: II 72.  
 31,48: I 110.  
 32: II 24.  
 32,3-6: I 212.  
 32,23ff.: I 241.  
 32,25ff.: II 49.  
 32,31: I 235.  
 32,33: I 110, 236.  
 33,17: I 235.  
 34: I 237. II 25, 58.  
 34,4: II 50.  
 35: II 24.  
 35,2: II 50.  
 35,11: II 28.  
 35,22: I 49. II 58.  
 35,22a: I 100.  
 36,,1,9: II 33.  
 36,31: II 10, 11.  
 37: I 241. II 46.  
 37,2: II 33.  
 37,21ff.: II 46.  
 37,25: II 25.  
 37,26f.: II 46.  
 37,27: II 46.  
 37,28: II 25.  
 37,28ff.: II 46.  
 37,29: II 46.  
 38: II 12, 182, 183, 185, 237.  
 39: II 46.  
 39ff.: I 241.  
 39,9: II 50.  
 40,15: II 46.  
 41: II 237.  
 41,29: I 172.  
 42: II 237.  
 43,14: II 28.  
 44,5: I 185.  
 45,4f.: II 46.  
 46,3: I 187.  
 48: I 237.  
 48,3: II 28.  
 48,15ff.: I 141.  
 48,20.: I 141.

48,22: I 69.  
 49: I 69, 141, 142, 143, 144.  
 II 57, 58, 59, 249.  
 49, 5ff.: I 237.  
 49,25: II 28.  
 50,10: II 11.

*Exodus* 1-7: II 15.  
 1-12: II 237.  
 1-15: I 163, 250. II 21, 26,  
 62, 78, 79.  
 2: II 39.  
 2,16-18: II 25.  
 2,18: II 47.  
 3: II 25, 62:  
 3-6: II 28.  
 3,1: II 25, 47.  
 3,1ff.: I 236.  
 3,2: II 49.  
 3,5: II 30.  
 3,6: I 187. II 30.  
 3,11ff.: II 146.  
 3,13: II 45.  
 3,14b: II 45.  
 3,15: II 25, 28.  
 3,21f.: II 50.  
 4: II 50.  
 4,10-16: I 204.  
 4,18: II 47.  
 4,20: II 25.  
 4,23: II 50.  
 4,24: II 49.  
 4,24ff.: II 26.  
 5,1ff.: II 50.  
 6: II 25, 28, 29, 62, 176.  
 6,2: I 187.  
 6,2ff.: II 25, 28.  
 6,2-5: II 28.  
 6,3: II 28, 71.  
 7-8: I 241.  
 7,8-24,11: II 15.  
 7,21: II 39.  
 11,2: II 50.  
 11,3: II 11.  
 12: II 215, 237.  
 12,7: II 44.

- 12,19: II 44.  
 12,26: I 173.  
 12,26f.: I 249.  
 12,27: I 222.  
 12,30: I 53.  
 12,35: II 50.  
 13: II 40, 62.  
 13,3b: II 40.  
 13,5: II 40.  
 13,9: II 40.  
 13,11: II 40.  
 13,14: II 40.  
 13,14f.: I 249.  
 13,14-15: I 222.  
 13,16: II 40.  
 14: II 26, 47.  
 14,2ff.: I 49.  
 15: I 120, 24.  
 15-18: II 53.  
 15,1: II 74.  
 15,1-18: I 163.  
 15,13-18: I 163.  
 15,15-17: II 11.  
 15,20: I 124, 163.  
 15,20ff.: I 141.  
 15,21: I 149, 151, 233.  
 15,22ff.: I 235.  
 15,25: I 236.  
 16: II 25.  
 17,1ff.: II 25.  
 17,4: II 10.  
 17,6: I 125.  
 17,7: I 235. II 10.  
 17,8ff.: II 30.  
 17,14: II 10.  
 17,16: I 139, 145, 233.  
 17,24: II 10.  
 18,1: II 25, 47.  
 18,5: II 25.  
 18,13ff.: I 215. II 25.  
 19,5-6: II 51.  
 19,7: II 30.  
 19,12-13: II 30.  
 19,20-22,25: II 57.  
 19,21-24: II 30.  
 20: I 221, 222. II 31, 53,  
 55, 66.  
 20-24: II 44.  
 20,1-17: II 52.  
 20ff.: II 25, 57.  
 20,2: I 223.  
 20,3-4: II 53.  
 20,5-7: II 53.  
 20,11: II 53.  
 20,13-15: II 72.  
 20,16: II 53.  
 20,18-21: II 30.  
 20,20-23: I 227.  
 20,22a: II 55.  
 20,22-23: I 227.  
 20,22-23,19: I 219.  
 20,22-23,33: II 55.  
 20,23: I 225. II 53, 54, 55, 56.  
 20,23-23,19: II 22.  
 20,23-24: II 65.  
 20,23-26: II 56.  
 20,24: II 66.  
 20,27-31: I 227.  
 20,37: I 50.  
 21ff.: II 53.  
 21,1: II 55, 56.  
 21,2ff.: I 225.  
 21,2-6: I 225.  
 21,2-11: I 219.  
 21,2-22,16: I 219.  
 21,7ff.: I 225.  
 21,7-11: I 224.  
 21,10: I 133.  
 21,12: I 224.  
 21,12-17 (÷ 13-14): I 219.  
 21,13f.: II 44.  
 21,14: I 224.  
 21,15-17: I 224.  
 21,18-27: I 219.  
 21,20-21: I 224.  
 21,22-23: I 224.  
 21,28: I 218.  
 21,28-32: I 219.  
 21,33-36: I 219.  
 21,37-22,3: I 219.  
 22,2-6: I 221.  
 22,4-5: I 68, 219.  
 22,6-8: I 219.  
 22,6ff.: I 158.  
 22,9-14: I 219.  
 22,15-16: I 219.  
 22,20-23: II 40.  
 22,21ff.: I 226.  
 22,23-26: I 226.  
 22,27: II 56.  
 22,27-23,3: I 225.  
 22,28: II 56.  
 22,28-29: II 56.  
 23: I 219.  
 23,1a: II 53.  
 23,1-19: II 56.  
 23,4-5: I 225, 226.  
 23,6-9: I 225.  
 23,9: II 40.  
 23,11b: II 40.  
 23,12: II 53.  
 23,13a: II 55.  
 23,13b: II 53, 55.  
 23,14-17: I 221.  
 23,20ff.: II 56.  
 23,24-26: II 40.  
 23,32-33: II 40.  
 24: I 222.  
 24,1: II 57.  
 24,1-2: II 57.  
 24,3: II 55.  
 24,3-8: I 210.  
 24,4: II 50.  
 24,7: II 55.  
 24,9-11: II 57.  
 24,10: I 91.  
 24,10: II 50.  
 24,12: I 23.  
 24,13: II 30.  
 24,15-18: I 227.  
 24,16f.: II 36.  
 25: II 31.  
 25-31: I 227.  
 25,1ff.: II 53.  
 25,16: II 53.  
 27,18: II 34.  
 28,41: II 39.  
 28,42: II 66.  
 30: II 39.  
 30,20: II 39.  
 31,17: II 36, 50.

- 31,18: I 23.  
 31,18: II 50.  
 32: II 25, 48, 50, 57.  
 32,15-16: I 23.  
 32,16: II 50.  
 32,17: II 30.  
 32,18: I 152. II 30.  
 33: II 34.  
 33,2: II 40.  
 33,6: I 100.  
 33,7: I 100. II 25.  
 33,11: II 30, 50.  
 33,31 ff.: II 112.  
 34: I 221. II 25, 44, 53, 57, 59.  
 34,1: I 23. II 50, 57.  
 34,4: II 57.  
 34,9: II 57.  
 34,11: II 40.  
 34,11-13: II 57.  
 34,11-16: I 222.  
 34,14: II 53.  
 34,14b: I 223.  
 34,15 ff.: II 57.  
 34,15-16: II 40.  
 34,17: II 50, 53, 54.  
 34,17-26: II 22.  
 34,18: I 221.  
 34,20: II 56.  
 34,21: II 53.  
 34,22-24: I 221.  
 34,24: II 40, 57.  
 34,27: I 23. II 10.  
 34,28: II 57.  
 34,29 ff.: II 36.  
 35-40: I 227.  
 35 ff.: II 72.  
*Leviticus* 1-6: II 32.  
 1-8: II 38.  
 1,1: I 56.  
 1,1-2: I 220.  
 5,1: I 188.  
 6,2: I 220.  
 7,1: I 220.  
 7,11: I 220.  
 7,18: I 220.  
 7,28-36: I 221.  
 7,32: II 69.  
 7,37: II 38.  
 9,1 ff.: I 238.  
 10,4: II 25.  
 10,7: II 39.  
 11: II 41.  
 11-15: II 38.  
 11,1-23: I 221.  
 11,41: I 221.  
 11,42: I 56.  
 11,46-47: I 220.  
 11,47: I 221.  
 12: I 189.  
 12,7: I 220.  
 13 f.: I 189.  
 13,33: I 56.  
 13,59: I 220.  
 14,1 ff.: II 64.  
 14,2: I 220.  
 14,3: I 220.  
 14,33 ff.: II 65.  
 14,54-57: I 220.  
 15: I 189.  
 15,32-33: I 220.  
 16: II 38, 39.  
 16,5: I 218.  
 17: II 31, 64.  
 17-26: I 207.  
 17-26: II 22, 32, 37.  
 17,1-2: I 227.  
 17,3 ff.: II 25.  
 17,37 (38): I 220.  
 18: II 38, 41.  
 18,6-18: I 221.  
 19,18: II 38.  
 19,23 ff.: I 225.  
 19,30: I 225.  
 19,31: I 186.  
 19,32: I 223.  
 20: I 224. II 38, 41.  
 20,6: I 186.  
 20,27: I 186, 225.  
 21: II 36.  
 21,7: II 131.  
 22,23: I 227.  
 23: I 260.  
 23,9: I 221, 227.  
 23,18-19: I 260.  
 23,21: I 221.  
 23,39-43: I 221.  
 24,11: I 100.  
 24,15: I 225.  
 24,17: I 225.  
 25: II 70.  
 25,10 ff.: II 237.  
 26: I 261.  
 26,1-46: I 227.  
 27,34: I 30.  
*Numeri* 1,24-27: II 72.  
 1,46: II 34.  
 2: II 25, 36.  
 2,32: II 34.  
 3,1: II 33.  
 3,32: II 34.  
 4,3-33: II 34.  
 5,3: II 65.  
 5,11 ff.: I 158, 190.  
 5,23: I 44.  
 5,29: I 220.  
 6,13: I 220.  
 6,21: I 220.  
 6,22-27: II 72.  
 6,24-27: I 187.  
 7,12 ff.: II 37.  
 8,24-25: II 34.  
 9,6-13: I 222.  
 10: II 39.  
 10,11: II 21.  
 10,11-28: I 227.  
 10,29: II 25, 47.  
 10,29 ff.: II 47.  
 10,35: I 57.  
 10,35 ff.: I 140.  
 11: II 25.  
 11,24: II 25.  
 11,26: II 25.  
 11,30: II 25.  
 12,3: II 11.  
 12,7 f.: II 11.  
 12,8: II 50.  
 13,14: II 130.  
 13,19: II 65.



14,19f.: II 50.  
 14,26: II 112.  
 15,23: I 222.  
 15,36: I 222.  
 16-17: I 238.  
 16,17: II 26.  
 17: I 241.  
 17,1ff.: I 185.  
 18: I 221.  
 18: II 39, 215.  
 18,7: II 39.  
 19,10b: I 220.  
 19,14a: I 220.  
 20,1ff.: II 25.  
 20,11: I 125.  
 20,14-19: I 212.  
 21: I 146, 262.  
 21,4ff.: I 236.  
 21,14: I 145. II 11.  
 21,14-15: I 141.  
 21,17-18: I 125, 144.  
 21,27: I 107, 112.  
 21,27-30: I 127, 145.  
 21,33-35: II 40.  
 22ff.: I 140.  
 22-24: II 21.  
 22,1: II 11.  
 22,28ff.: I 241.  
 23,7-10: I 142.  
 23,9: I 113. II 51.  
 23,18-24: I 142.  
 23,21: II 51.  
 24: I 69.  
 24,3-9: I 142.  
 24,4: II 129, 28.  
 24,15-19: I 142.  
 24,16: II 28.  
 24,23: I 143.  
 25: II 73.  
 25,12a: I 56.  
 26,15-47: II 72.  
 27,1-11: I 222.  
 28,27-30: I 260.  
 30,17: I 220.  
 31: I 222.  
 31,27: I 215.  
 32,33: II 11, 40.

32,40: II 40.  
 32,41: II 11.  
 33,2: II 10.  
 34: II 21.  
 35: II 70.  
 35,10ff.: I 225.  
 35,14: II 11.  
 36,1-12: I 222.

*Deuteronomium* I: II 25.

1-4: II 40.  
 1-11: I 190.  
 1,1: II 11.  
 1,1-2: II 40.  
 1,1-4,43: II 23.  
 1,1-4,44: II 41.  
 1,3a: II 40.  
 1,4-4,40: II 40.  
 1,5: II 11.  
 1,9: I 216.  
 1,9ff.: I 215.  
 1,37: II 112.  
 2,8ff.: I 261.  
 2,12: II 11.  
 3,8: II 11.  
 3,11: I 235.  
 3,14: II 11.  
 3,26: II 112.  
 4,1-10: II 23.  
 4,2: I 23.  
 4,3: II 66.  
 4,12: II 52.  
 4,19: II 42.  
 4,21: II 112.  
 4,24: II 43.  
 4,44-10,5: II 40.  
 4,44-30,20: II 22.  
 4,45-5,31: II 41.  
 4,46: II 11.  
 5: I 221, 222. II 44, 53, 55.  
 5,5: I 223.  
 5,6-21: II 52.  
 5,9-10: II 53.  
 5,14f.: II 42.  
 6: II 41.  
 6,4: I 56.

6,4ff.: II 42.  
 6,5: II 42, 43.  
 6,6ff.: I 173.  
 6,16: II 43.  
 6,20-24: I 24.  
 6,20-24: II 74.  
 6,20ff.: I 173.  
 7,1f.: II 43.  
 7,7: II 43.  
 7,9: II 42.  
 7,36: ff. II 43.  
 9: II 41.  
 9,3: II 43.  
 9,5: II 43.  
 9,17-20: II 112.  
 9,25-29: II 112.  
 10: II 41.  
 10,1ff.: II 57.  
 10,4: II 52.  
 10,6-7: II 40.  
 10,8: II 11.  
 10,8-27,4: II 40.  
 10,15: II 43.  
 10,17: II 42, 43.  
 10,19: II 43.  
 11: II 41.  
 11,29f.: II 42.  
 12: II 31, 66, 97, 99.  
 12-20: I 261.  
 12-26: II 41.  
 12,ff.: II 42.  
 12,2ff.: II 43.  
 12,3: II 43, 67.  
 12,15: II 43.  
 12,16: II 67.  
 12,19: II 44.  
 12,20ff.: II 43.  
 12,22: II 67.  
 12,32: I 23.  
 13,1ff.: II 43.  
 14: II 41.  
 14,24ff.: II 43.  
 14,27: II 44.  
 14,29: II 44.  
 15,14-14: I 221.  
 16,5ff.: II 44.  
 16,11: II 44.

16,14: II 44.  
 16,18: II 44.  
 16,18-20 + 17,8-13: I 253.  
 16,21: II 67.  
 16,21f.: II 43.  
 16,21-17,7: I 253.  
 16,22: II 43.  
 17: II 38, 96.  
 17,2ff.: II 43.  
 17,3: II 67.  
 17,8: I 158.  
 17,8ff.: I 215. II 44.  
 17,14-20: I 228. II 68.  
 17,18: II 9.  
 18: I 221. II 67.  
 18,1-4: I 221.  
 18,11: I 186.  
 18,6-8: II 67.  
 18,6ff.: II 44.  
 18,9ff.: II 43.  
 18,10: II 67.  
 18,11: II 67.  
 19,1ff.: II 44.  
 19,14: I 79.  
 19,15: I 225.  
 20,5-8: I 206.  
 20,17f.: II 43.  
 21-25: I 261.  
 21,1-8: I 158.  
 21,5: I 187.  
 21,15-17: I 219.  
 21,23: I 218.  
 22,5a: I 225.  
 22,9ff.: I 218.  
 22,13-29: I 219.  
 23,2: I 189.  
 23,4: I 189.  
 23,18: II 67.  
 24,1ff.: II 210.  
 24,8: I 220.  
 25,9: I 210. II 185.  
 26ff.: I 150.  
 26,5ff.: I 206.  
 26,5-10: I 229.  
 26,5b-9: I 24. II 74.  
 26,13ff.: I 190, 206.  
 27: I 143, 223. II 41.

27,1-8: II 42.  
 27,4: I 66.  
 27,5-7: II 40.  
 27,8-31,13: II 40.  
 27,15-16: II 41.  
 27,15ff.: I 221.  
 27,16ff.: I 188.  
 28: I 210.  
 28-30: II 41.  
 28,37: I 167.  
 28,69: II 41.  
 29-30: II 41.  
 29ff.: II 43.  
 29,1ff.: II 214.  
 30: II 68.  
 30,1: II 41.  
 30,9-13: I 261.  
 30,24-27: I 261.  
 31,1: I 99.  
 31,1ff.: II 23.  
 31,9: II 10, 11.  
 31,9ff.: II 78.  
 31,14-15: II 40.  
 31,16-22: II 40.  
 31,19: II 10.  
 31,23a: II 40.  
 31,24-30: II 40.  
 32: I 120, 160, 208. II 23,  
 40, 59.  
 32<sup>a</sup>33: II 44.  
 32,1ff.: I 49.  
 32,1-47: II 40.  
 32,2-5: I 150.  
 32,8: II 42.  
 32,33: I 69.  
 32,48-52: II 40.  
 33: I 141, 142, 143, 144,  
 146. II 23, 57, 58, 59, 249.  
 33,7: II 58.  
 33,8ff.: I 215.  
 33,11: II 59.  
 33,12: II 58.  
 33,16: I 236.  
 33,18: II 59.  
 33,19: II 59.  
 33,20: II 59.  
 34: II 23.

34,1-12: II 11.  
 34,1: II 11.  
 34,1a- II 40.  
 34,1b-4: II 40.  
 34,5-6: II 40.  
 34,6: II 11.  
 34,7ff.: II 73.  
 34,7-9: II 40.  
 34,10-12: II 11, 40.

*The Book of Joshua 1-2:*

I 249.  
 1-6: I 249.  
 1-11: II 23.  
 1-12: I 249, 262, 263. II 74,  
 75, 84, 85.  
 1,1-12,24: II 82.  
 1,1-18: II 85.  
 2: II 85.  
 2-9: II 84.  
 2-12: I 251.  
 2,17-21: II 85.  
 3: II 85.  
 3,1ff.: II 82.  
 4-5: II 82.  
 4,6: I 249.  
 4,9: II 83.  
 4,19: II 82.  
 5,1: II 83.  
 5,2: I 236.  
 5,9: II 83.  
 5,15: I 236.  
 6,25: II 83.  
 7: I 186.  
 7,7-9: I 208.  
 7,19: I 190.  
 7,26: II 83.  
 7,27: I 190.  
 8,28: II 84.  
 8,30-35: II 42,85.  
 9,15: I 209.  
 10: I 235, 262. II 84, 92.  
 10,12-13: I 139.  
 10,12-14: II 84.  
 10,13: I 145. II 98.  
 11: II 89.

11,1-9: II 84.  
 11,10-15: II 84.  
 11,21 ff.: II 82.  
 12,1-24: II 85.  
 13-19: I 212.  
 13-19: II 75.  
 13-21: II 23.  
 13,1-21,42: II 82.  
 13-1-21,42: II 84.  
 14,1a: II 84.  
 14,4b: II 84.  
 14,5: II 84.  
 15,13 ff.: II 82.  
 15,63: II 85.  
 17,10-11: II 85.  
 18,9: II 83.  
 19: I 212.  
 19,10-39: II 85.  
 19,49a: II 84.  
 21: II 84.  
 21,43-22,6 + 23,1-6: II 85.  
 21,43-23,16: II 82.  
 21,43-24,33: II 82.  
 22: II 23.  
 23: I 207. II 85.  
 23-24: II 23.  
 24: I 207. II 74, 84, 85.  
 24,1: I 191.  
 24,1-28: II 82.  
 24,2: II 50,51.  
 24,2b-13: I 24.  
 24,25: I 236.  
 24,26: II 83.  
 24,29: II 111.  
 24,30: I 99.  
 24,31: II 85.

*The Book of Judges* 1:

I 249, 251, 262, 263.  
 II 74, 75, 84, 85, 89, 90.  
 1,1-2,5: II 23, 87, 88.  
 1,2: II 88.  
 2,1-5: II 88.  
 2,6-16,31: II 87, 88.  
 2,8: II 111.  
 2,9: I 99.  
 3: I 192.

3,31: II 87.  
 4: II 58.  
 5: I 42, 111, 139, 150.  
 II 58, 88, 90, 167.  
 5,2: I 49.  
 5,12: I 23, 124, 140.  
 5,15 f.: II 58.  
 5,15b ff.: I 206.  
 5,31: II 43.  
 6: II 90.  
 6-8: II 58.  
 6,11-24: I 236.  
 6,25: II 65.  
 6,25-32: I 236, 240.  
 6,25-34: II 91.  
 6,32: I 237.  
 7,18: I 140.  
 7,25: II 90.  
 8,4-27: I 244.  
 8,14: I 46, 173.  
 8,18: II 88.  
 8,18 ff.: II 90.  
 9: I 191, 244. II 87, 89.  
 9,7-15: I 179. II 90.  
 9,7-20: I 206.  
 9,8-18: I 210.  
 9,27: I 126.  
 9,37: I 185.  
 10,1 ff.: 86, 89.  
 10,14: II 11.  
 11: I 241. II 89.  
 11,12-28: II 90.  
 12,7 ff.: 87, 89.  
 12,34: I 141.  
 13,3 ff.: I 134.  
 13,3-5: I 186.  
 13,19-20: II 65.  
 13,23: I 192.  
 13,25: I 235.  
 14,10-18: I 128.  
 14,12 ff.: I 178.  
 14,14b: I 178.  
 14,18a: I 178.  
 15,9-17: I 235.  
 15,18-19: I 235.  
 15,20: II 88.  
 16: II 88, 89.  
 16,23 ff.: I 141.

16,28: I 208.  
 16,31: II 88.  
 17-18: II 87, 90.  
 17 f.: II 54, 59.  
 17-21: II 88, 89.  
 18,12: I 235.  
 18,29: II 11.  
 18,30: I 56. II 90.  
 19,21: II 87.  
 20-21: I 144. II 89.  
 21,4: II 65.  
 24,28: II 88.  
 24,29 ff.: II 88.

*1st. Book of Samuel.*

1-4: II 65.  
 1-7: II 91.  
 1-15: II 93.  
 1. Sam 1-2. Sam. 8 II 94.  
 1,17: I 186.  
 2: I 145, 163. II 95.  
 2,10: II 95.  
 2,27 ff.: I 238.  
 2,27-36: II 93.  
 3: I 186. II 93.  
 4-6: II 92, 94.  
 4,5 f.: I 140.  
 4,18: II 89.  
 4,18b: II 95.  
 5,23: I 244.  
 6,15: II 95.  
 7-8: II 93.  
 7-8 + 12 and 15: II 95.  
 7-8 + 15: II 93.  
 7-15: II 93.  
 7,2-8,22: I 239.  
 7,3: II 95.  
 7,4: II 95.  
 7,15: II 95.  
 7,17: II 65.  
 8-15: II 91.  
 8,11-17: I 210.  
 8,12a: I 228.  
 9-10,16: II 93.  
 9,13: II 65.  
 10: I 168.  
 10,8: II 65.



10,10: I 184, 193.  
 10,11: II 93.  
 10,12: I 168.  
 10,17-27: I 239.  
 10,17ff.: II 95.  
 10,25: II 92.  
 10,25b-27: II 95.  
 11: II 93, 95.  
 11,1-15: I 244.  
 11,12-14: II 95.  
 12: I 191, 207, 239. II 93.  
 12: II 93.  
 12,8: II 74.  
 13-14: I 244.  
 13,1: II 95.  
 13,7b-14: II 95.  
 13,7b-15: II 93.  
 13,8f.: II 65.  
 14: I 186.  
 14,24ff.: I 139.  
 14,41: I 99.  
 14,49-51: II 94.  
 14,50: I 228.  
 15: I 257. II 92, 93.  
 16-31: II 91.  
 16,4-2: I 244.  
 16,4-5: II 65.  
 16,14-23: II 93.  
 16,18: I 204.  
 17: I 240. II 93.  
 17,1-18,2: II 93.  
 17,8-10,43-44: I 140.  
 17,45: I 240.  
 17,55: II 93.  
 18,6: I 124.  
 18,7: I 141, 149.  
 18,7b: I 149.  
 19: I 168.  
 19,13: II 54.  
 19,18: I 184.  
 19,24: I 168, 193. II 93.  
 20: II 93.  
 20,26: I 189.  
 21,4ff.: I 189.  
 22,6ff.: I 206.  
 21,11-16: II 93.  
 23,1-13: II 92.

23,6ff.: I 186.  
 23,19-28: II 93.  
 24,14: I 168.  
 25: I 204. II 93.  
 26: II 93.  
 26,1ff.: II 93.  
 27,1ff.: II 93.  
 27,1-28,2: II 92.  
 28: I 186.  
 29,1-30,26: II 92.  
 29,5: I 141.  
 30,25: I 215, 228.  
 31: II 93.

*2nd. Book of Samuel:*

I 248, 251. II 94.  
 1: I 111, 262. II 93, 94, 95.  
 1-4: II 91.  
 1,1: II 92.  
 1,17: I 135.  
 1,17ff.: I 136.  
 1,18: I 135, 145. II 92.  
 1,21: I 130, 135, 137, 179.  
 1,23: I 137.  
 1,23-24: I 149.  
 2-6: II 94.  
 2,4a: II 92.  
 2,10a-11: II 95.  
 2,25ff.: I 140.  
 2,25-26: I 206.  
 3: II 94, 95.  
 3,2-5: II 94.  
 3,20-39: II 92.  
 3,33ff.: I 135, 136.  
 4,1a,5-12: II 92.  
 5-24: I 253. II 91.  
 5,3: I 210. II 92.  
 5,4-5: II 95.  
 5,5: I 236.  
 5,8: I 168. II 92.  
 5,13-15: II 94.  
 5,14ff.: II 94.  
 5,22ff.: I 185.  
 6: II 65, 92, 94.  
 6,5: I 152.  
 7: I 160, 165, 187. II 92, 94, 95, 96.

7,7-17: I 161.  
 8: II 94.  
 8,16: I 228.  
 8,16-18: II 94.  
 8,17: I 171.  
 9: II 92.  
 9-20: I 244.  
 9,16ff.: I 137.  
 9-20 + 1 Ki 1-2: II 93.  
 9-24: II 92.  
 9,1: II 94.  
 10,1-12,31: II 92.  
 10,12: I 206.  
 11,15: I 212.  
 11,27: I 245.  
 12: I 257. II 174.  
 12,1ff.: I 181.  
 12,1-4: I 179.  
 12,23: I 245.  
 13-1 Ki 1: I 118.  
 13-20 + 1 Ki 1-2: II 92.  
 14,1ff.: I 215.  
 14,1-24: I 204.  
 14,2ff.: I 228.  
 14,27: II 93.  
 15,2f.: I 215, 228.  
 15,25f.: I 245.  
 17,14: I 245.  
 18,18: II 93.  
 19,36: I 148.  
 20: II 92.  
 20,1: I 142.  
 20,14-22: I 204.  
 20,23: I 228.  
 20,23-26: II 94.  
 21-24: II 94.  
 21,1-14: II 94.  
 21,1-14 + 2 Sam 24: II 92.  
 21,15-22: II 94.  
 21,19: I 240. II 93.  
 22: I 49. II 94, 95.  
 23: II 94, 95.  
 23,1-7: I 148.  
 23,8-38: II 94.  
 24: I 155, 236. II 94.  
 24,5-7: I 230.  
 31-37: II 92.

*1st. Book of Kings* 1: II 92.

1-2: I 244. II 91, 92.

1-9: II 92.

1,50f.: II 56.

2,1-9: I 191, 207.

2,11: II 89.

2,28: II 56.

2,42f.: I 228.

2,44f.: I 245.

3-11: II 100.

3,4: II 65.

3,5ff.: I 186.

4,3: I 171.

4,4: I 228.

4,5: II 92.

4,7-19: I 230.

5: I 179.

5,9-14: I 172. II 172.

5,11: I 169, 174.

5,11f.: I 169.

5,12: II 179, 240.

5,12ff.: I 177.

5,16-23: I 209.

6-8: I 245.

6,1: II 89.

8: I 165, 262. II 97, 100.

8,12-33: II 98.

8,13: I 145.

8,23-53: I 209.

8,31: I 190.

8,31ff.: I 146.

8,31-32: I 158.

8,33-40: I 155.

8,53a: I 145.

9,7: I 167.

10,1: I 177.

10,1-10: II 172.

11,1-13: II 100.

11,29-39: I 239.

11,34: II 56.

11,41: I 245. II 98.

12: I 206, 210. II 93.

12,3ff.: I 206.

12,16: I 140, 142.

12,33-13,32: I 239.

13-14: I 237.

13-46: II 92.

13,17: I 184.

13,23-24: II 172.

14: I 257.

14,1-18: I 239.

14,17: II 179.

14,19: II 98.

14,29: II 98.

15,21: II 179.

16,20: II 98.

16,34: II 84.

17-19: I 237.

17,2-6: I 239.

17,7: I 240.

17,7ff.: I 241.

17,7-16: I 239.

17,17: I 240.

18: I 239.

18,12: II 127.

18,21: I 239.

18,26: I 193.

18,32: II 65.

18,42: I 193.

19: I 239.

19,3ff.: II 49.

19,10: II 65.

20-22: I 244.

20,9-17: I 90.

20,11: I 168.

21: I 239, 257. II 136.

21,8-10: I 212.

21,9-12: I 154.

21,15: I 228.

22: I 193, 257. II 147.

22,39: II 98.

*2nd. Book of Kings* I 88.

II 20, 96.

1-8: I 237.

1,2-7: I 239.

1,2-17: I 239.

2: I 249.

2,5: I 184.

2,16: II 127.

2,23-25: I 239, 240.

3,15: I 193.

4,1ff.: I 241.

4,18: I 240.

4,38-41: I 239.

5,5-6: I 212.

6,1-7: I 239.

8-9: I 239.

8,20-22: II 144.

8,27: II 47.

9: I 257.

9-10: I 244.

9,11: I 193.

10,1-3: I 212.

12,10-17: I 245.

13,27: I 140.

14,6: II 10.

14,9: I 179, 181.

14,23-29: II 140.

14,25: II 144, 147.

15,20: I 228.

15,30: II 130.

15,31: II 98.

16,3: II 149.

17: II 97.

17,27f.: I 73.

18-20: II 101.

18,4: I 236.

18,13-16: II 101.

18,13-20,19: II 104.

18,17-19,9a: II 101.

18,17-19,36: II 101.

18,19ff.: I 206.

18,26: II 168.

18,28ff.: I 206.

19,9-14: I 212.

19,9a + 36a-37: II 101.

19,35: II 101.

19,9b-35: II 101.

21,1-18: II 238.

22: II 13, 100.

22-23: I 23, 106, 245.

II 43, 67, 99.

22,3: I 171.

22,12: I 170, 171.

22,20: II 99.

23: I 260. II 68, 69, 100.

23,1ff.: I 33.

23,1-3: I 210.

23,4: II 67.

23,5: II 67.

23,6: II 67.  
 23,7: II 67.  
 23,9: II 44, 67, 128.  
 23,10: II 67.  
 23,11: II 67.  
 23,12-17: I 90.  
 23,14: II 67.  
 23,24: II 67.  
 23,27-27: II 97.  
 24,2-4: II 97.  
 24,5: II 98.  
 24,18-25: II 116.  
 25,4-7: II 186.  
 25,27-30: II 99.

*The Book of Isaiah* I: II 138.

I-12: II 103.  
 I-25: II 103.  
 I-39: II 104, 113.  
 I,2f.: I 199.  
 I,4ff.: I 200.  
 I,4-9: I 199.  
 I,5: II 66.  
 I,9-17: II 103.  
 I,10-17 I 164, 189, 201.  
 II 101.  
 I,17: I 202.  
 I,18-20: I 200.  
 2: I 242.  
 2,1: II 106.  
 2,1ff.: I 152. II 108.  
 2,2-4: II 148.  
 3,3: I 172.  
 3,12-15: I 199.  
 4: II 108.  
 5: I 122. II 103, 181.  
 5,1ff.: I 130, 133. II 181.  
 5,1-7: I 129, 179, 180, 252.  
 5,5-6: I 179.  
 5,6: I 130, 134.  
 5,8ff.: I 199, 256. II 113.  
 5,11-13: I 127.  
 5,11-14: II 103.  
 5,19: I 168.  
 5,25-30: I 256. II 113.  
 5,26: I 98.

6: I 242, 253. II 103.  
 6,1: II 103.  
 6,3: I 150.  
 6,13: II 108.  
 7: I 257. II 103, 110.  
 7-8: II 103, 108.  
 7,3: I 196. II 103.  
 7,9: I 200, 201.  
 7,9b: I 196.  
 7,10-27: I 134.  
 7,14: I 77, 134, 196.  
 8: II 110.  
 8,1: I 43, 196.  
 8,1ff.: I 196.  
 8,1-2: I 246.  
 8,2: II 157.  
 8,3: II 103.  
 8,9-10: I 198.  
 8,9-11: II 138.  
 8,11: I 192, 193.  
 8,14: I 89.  
 8,16: I 24, 105. II 105, 106.  
 8,19: I 186.  
 9: I 122.  
 9,1ff.: I 134, II 103, 106,  
 107, 108.  
 9,1-6: I 148.  
 9,2: I 126.  
 9,6: I 56.  
 9,7-20: I 256. II 113.  
 9,7-20 + 5,25-29 (30?):  
 I 199.  
 10,1ff.: I 256. II 113.  
 10,5: II 107.  
 10,5ff.: I 196. II 103, 106,  
 152.  
 10,5-12,6: II 137, 159.  
 10,5-18: II 108.  
 10,15: I 180.  
 10,19: I 46.  
 10,19-26: II 108.  
 11,1ff.: I 134. II 103, 106,  
 107, 108.  
 11,1-9: I 148.  
 11,9: I 242.  
 11,10ff.: II 107.  
 11,14: II 142.  
 12,1: I 152.

13-14: II 107.  
 13-23: II 103.  
 13,6: II 35.  
 13,7-22: II 135.  
 13,17: II 198.  
 13,17-22: II 135.  
 14,4ff.: I 138, 167.  
 14,12ff.: I 242.  
 14,13: I 242. II 134.  
 15-16: II 107, 117.  
 15,15-21,1: II 113.  
 16,9-10: I 126.  
 16,10: I 126.  
 17,11: I 119.  
 18,5-6: II 108.  
 19,16-25: II 107.  
 19,18-25: II 106.  
 19,23-25: II 159.  
 20: I 257.  
 21,1-10: I 196. II 107.  
 21,2: II 198.  
 21,3: I 192.  
 21,11-12: I 128.  
 22,1-14: II 104.  
 22,13: I 127.  
 22,14-25: II 104.  
 22,18: I 196.  
 23,6ff.: I 199.  
 23,16: I 124, 127.  
 24-27: I 256. II 104, 107, 114.  
 24,18: I 242.  
 25,2: II 107.  
 26-37: I 257.  
 26,5: II 107.  
 26,10-13: I 156.  
 26,19: II 104.  
 27,10ff.: II 107.  
 27,13: II 159.  
 28-32: II 113.  
 28-33: II 104.  
 28,4b.: I 179.  
 28,7-13: I 184.  
 28,10: I 193.  
 28,16: I 196. II 104.  
 28,16-22: I 201.  
 30,7: I 193, 196.  
 30,8: I 246.



- 30,9: I 152.  
 30,15: I 200, II 104.  
 30,15-17: I 201.  
 30,29: I 124.  
 33: I 162, 164.  
 33,7-9: I 156.  
 33,14-16: I 189.  
 34: II 104.  
 34-35: I 256, II 104, 107.  
 34,4: I 43.  
 34,5 ff.: II 143.  
 36-36: II 104.  
 36-39: I 237, II 103.  
 37,22: I 126.  
 38,8: I 139.  
 38,9: I 153.  
 38,9-20: II 104.  
 38,18-19: I 157.  
 40-55: I 256, II 104, 107,  
     109, 114, 115.  
 40-66: II 103, 104, 106, 109.  
 40 ff.: I 107, 162, II 104, 105,  
     106, 107, 112, 114.  
 40,1: II 115.  
 40,3: II 161.  
 40,9-10: II 104.  
 41-55: II 110.  
 41,2: II 104.  
 41,2-5: II 105.  
 41,8: II 110, 111.  
 41,13: II 111.  
 41,21-29: II 105.  
 41,22 ff.: II 105.  
 41,25: II 104.  
 41,27: II 104.  
 42,1-4: II 110.  
 42,1 ff.: I 84, II 104, 110, 111.  
 42,5-7 (or 8): II 110.  
 42,8-9: I 151.  
 42,9: II 105.  
 42,12: II 111.  
 42,13: I 140, 151.  
 42,19: II 110, 111.  
 42,22-24: II 104.  
 43,8-13: II 105.  
 43,10: II 110.  
 43,14: II 104.  
 43,22 ff.: I 200.  
 44-45: II 112.  
 44,1: II 110.  
 44,1-2: II 111.  
 44,8: II 105.  
 44,21-23: I 201.  
 44,24-28: I 151.  
 44,27: II 104.  
 44,28: II 104, 105.  
 45,1: II 104.  
 45,4: II 110.  
 45,9-13: I 200.  
 45,9b: I 180.  
 45,21: II 105.  
 46,1 f.: II 104.  
 46,8-12: II 105.  
 46,11: II 104.  
 47: I 126.  
 47,1 ff.: I 104.  
 47,9,13: I 172.  
 48: II 105.  
 48,14: II 104.  
 48,20: II 104, 110.  
 49: II 113.  
 49,1-6: II 110.  
 49,1 ff.: II 104, 110.  
 49,3: II 110.  
 49,5-6,8-12: II 112.  
 49,6: II 111.  
 49,7-12: II 110.  
 50,1: I 210.  
 50,4: I 156.  
 50,4 ff.: I 164, II 104, 110,  
     111.  
 50,10: II 111.  
 50,10-11: I 158, II 110.  
 51,3: II 104.  
 51,9-11: I 140.  
 51, 9-16: I 164, II 110, 113.  
 51,9 ff.: I 242.  
 51,12-16: I 140, 158.  
 52,2 f.: II 104.  
 52,9: II 104.  
 52,12 ff.: II 110.  
 52,13-15: II 110.  
 52,13-53,12: I 164, II 104,  
     110.  
 53: II 111, 112, 115, 144, 159.  
 53,1-12: II 110.  
 55: II 114.  
 56: II 114.  
 56-66: II 104, 109, 110.  
 56,1: I 202.  
 56,1-8: I 201.  
 56,3-5: I 247.  
 56,5: II 109.  
 56,12: I 127.  
 57,1-6: II 110.  
 57,7-13: II 109.  
 58: I 201.  
 58,1-7: I 201.  
 58,1-12: I 200.  
 58,6 ff.: I 202.  
 58,7: I 202.  
 58,12: II 104, 105.  
 59,12-14: I 156.  
 60: II 109.  
 61,1 ff.: II 110.  
 61,4: II 105.  
 62,1-4: II 104.  
 63,1-6: I 151, 180, 195.  
 63,7-64,11: II 109.  
 63,7-65,19: I 164.  
 63,7-65,25: I 252, II 110.  
 63,18: II 105.  
 64,5-7: I 156.  
 64,9: II 104.  
 64,10: II 105.  
 65,17-25: I 242.  
 66,3: I 202.  
 66,9: II 105.

*The Book of Jeremiah. I:*

- II 116, 146.  
 1-12: I 71.  
 1-25: II 120.  
 1-45: II 121.  
 1,1: II 115.  
 1,2: II 116.  
 1,6: I 204.  
 1,9: I 204.  
 1,10: II 120.  
 1,11,13: I 197.  
 1,12: I 24.

- 1,13 ff.: II 122.  
 1,14: II 134.  
 2-25: II 116.  
 2,4-9: I 199.  
 2,8: I 216.  
 2,10-13: I 199.  
 2,25: II 120.  
 3: II 121.  
 3,1: I 202.  
 3,8: I 210.  
 3,13: I 200.  
 3,22-25: I 164.  
 4-6: II 121., 122.  
 4,1 f.: I 200.  
 4,1-2: I 158.  
 4,3 f.: I 200.  
 4,6: II 134.  
 4,19: I 192.  
 4,19-21: II 121.  
 4,19-29: I 195.  
 4,20-21: I 164.  
 4,23: I 242.  
 4,29: I 164.  
 6,1: II 134.  
 6,16-20: I 201.  
 6,20 ff.: II 120.  
 6,22: I 196.  
 6,24: I 164.  
 7: I 107, II 119.  
 7,1-15: II 120.  
 7,1-8,3: II 118.  
 7,3-7: I 200.  
 7,5: I 24.  
 7,16: II 120.  
 7,17: II 120.  
 7,21: I 201, 202, II 120.  
 7,21-23: II 101.  
 7,22: I 201.  
 7,23: I 202.  
 7,25: II 120.  
 7,26: II 120.  
 7,34: II 120.  
 8,9: I 169.  
 8,16: I 107.  
 8,18: I 164.  
 8,18-23: II 121.  
 9,16: I 107, 135.  
 9,21: I 62.  
 10,19-22: II 121.  
 10,22: I 196.  
 11: II 118.  
 11-20: I 164.  
 11,14: II 120.  
 11,18-20: II 121.  
 11,21: II 115.  
 11,21-23: I 158, II 121.  
 11,23: II 115.  
 12,1-6: II 121.  
 12,5-6: I 158.  
 13,15-17: I 200.  
 13,17: II 121.  
 13,18-22: I 199.  
 14: I 162.  
 14,1-15,3: I 164.  
 14,7 ff.: I 164.  
 14,10: I 158.  
 14,11 ff.: II 120.  
 14,17-18: II 121.  
 14,20 ff.: I 164.  
 15,1: I 187.  
 15,1-4: I 158.  
 15,10-12: II 121.  
 15,15-21: II 121.  
 15,16: I 251.  
 15,19-20: I 158.  
 16,2: II 115.  
 16,9: I 128.  
 16,12: II 120.  
 16,19: II 120.  
 17,1: I 43.  
 17,12-13: I 150.  
 17,12-18: II 121.  
 17,19-27: II 118.  
 18: II 131.  
 18,7: II 120.  
 18,9: II 120.  
 18,11 ff.: II 120.  
 18,18: I 23, 107, 169, 216.  
 18,18-23: II 121.  
 19,10 ff.: I 140.  
 20,3: I 193, 196.  
 20,7-9: II 121.  
 20,9: I 192, 194.  
 20,10-13: II 121.  
 20,14-18: II 121.  
 20,15: I 134.  
 21,1 ff.: I 200, 257.  
 21,1-6: I 257.  
 21,9: II 120.  
 22,13-19: I 199.  
 22,18 ff.: I 135.  
 22,24: II 156.  
 22,27-30: I 190.  
 23,5-6: I 148.  
 23,9: I 256, II 121.  
 23,13: II 118.  
 23,14: II 118.  
 23,28: I 168.  
 24,9: I 167.  
 25,1-11 a: II 120.  
 25,3: II 116.  
 25,10: I 128, II 120.  
 25,13: II 120.  
 25,13 b.: I 256.  
 25,15 ff.: II 117.  
 25,15-38: II 117.  
 25,30: I 126.  
 25,30-31: II 140.  
 25,30-38: II 117.  
 26: I 257.  
 26-45: II 116.  
 26,1-6: II 120.  
 26,3: I 200.  
 26,5: II 120.  
 26,18: II 147, 148.  
 26,24: I 170, 171.  
 27: II 120.  
 28: II 120.  
 29: II 232.  
 29,1-23: II 120.  
 29,7: II 145.  
 29,24-32: I 184, 213.  
 29,26: I 193.  
 29,27: II 115.  
 29,28: II 120.  
 30-31: II 118.  
 30-33: II 116.  
 30,1-4: I 256.  
 30,2: I 23.  
 31,29: I 168.  
 31,31 ff.: I 231.

32: I 209, 256, 257, II 185.  
 32,1: II 121.  
 32,2-5: II 121.  
 32,7: II 121.  
 32,7-9: II 115.  
 32,8: II 131.  
 32,12: II 117.  
 33,14-26: II 118.  
 34,1-7: II 120.  
 35: II 131.  
 36: I 23, 24, 43, 106, 107,  
 246, 256, 257, II 117, 119,  
 120.  
 36,1-10: I 155.  
 36,18: I 43.  
 36,23: I 43.  
 36,32: I 43.  
 37: I 257.  
 37,5: II 186.  
 38,2: II 120.  
 38,14-23: II 120.  
 38,22: I 112.  
 39,4-13: II 118.  
 40: I 256.  
 42: I 257.  
 43: I 257.  
 43,3: II 117.  
 43,6: II 117, 232.  
 43,8-13: II 120.  
 43,15-30: II 120.  
 43,44: II 120.  
 44: II 116.  
 44,1-16: II 120.  
 44,15ff.: II 120.  
 45: I 170, II 117, 121.  
 45,3: II 121.  
 46: II 117.  
 46-51: II 116, 117, 121.  
 46,1: I 256.  
 46,3-12: II 117.  
 46,6: II 117.  
 46,13: II 117.  
 47: II 117.  
 48-49: II 117.  
 48,1-47: II 117.  
 48,33: I 126.  
 48,40-41: II 117.

49: II 144.  
 49,7: I 169, II 144.  
 49,7-22: II 117, 143.  
 49,18: II 117.  
 49,19-21: II 117.  
 49,22: II 117.  
 50-51: II 117.  
 50,44-46: II 117.  
 50,50: II 117.  
 51: II 146.  
 51,11: II 198.  
 51,14: I 126.  
 51,28: II 198.  
 51,34: II 146.  
 51,44: II 146.  
 51,44 b.-49 a.: II 118.  
 52: II 116, 117.  
 52,27b-30: II 118.  
 52,52: I 171.

*The Book of Ezekiel. I:*

II 124, 125.  
 1-3: I 29, II 124.  
 1-24: II 128.  
 1,1: II 122, 123.  
 1,1ff.: I 242.  
 1,1-3: II 124.  
 1,1-28: I 29.  
 1,2: II 123.  
 1,3: II 122.  
 1,4: II 124.  
 1,13-14: II 124.  
 2,9-10: I 43.  
 2,9-3,3: I 23.  
 3,1ff.: I 251.  
 3,4: II 127.  
 3,4-9: II 124.  
 3,12: I 29.  
 3,12-15: II 127.  
 3,15: II 122.  
 3,22-24+4,4-5+3,26+24,  
 26-27+33,21-22: II 126.  
 3,24b-27: II 123.  
 4-6: II 125.  
 4-24: II 124.  
 4,1-3: II 128.  
 4,4-8: II 123.

4,9-17: II 124.  
 4,18: II 137.  
 5,2: II 127.  
 7,1-9: II 124.  
 8-9: II 125.  
 8,1: II 123.  
 8,1-4: II 127.  
 9,2: I 43, 242.  
 9,2ff.: I 42.  
 11,1: II 127.  
 11,13: II 127, 128.  
 11,24-25: II 125.  
 12,1-7: II 127.  
 12,2: II 127.  
 12,22: I 168.  
 12,22ff.: I 167.  
 14: II 128.  
 14,1: II 123.  
 14,14: II 174, 175, 202, 230.  
 14,20: II 174, 175, 202, 230.  
 15: I 180.  
 16: I 29, 129, 130, 180,  
 II 110, 181.  
 16,44: I 168.  
 17,1-24: I 180.  
 17,1-21: II 128.  
 17,2: I 168.  
 17,3: I 180.  
 17,3ff.: I 179.  
 18: I 202, II 128, 179.  
 18,2: I 168.  
 18,2f.: I 167.  
 18,30: I 200.  
 19: I 180.  
 19,1ff.: I 179, 180.  
 19,1-14: I 138.  
 19,1-14: II 128.  
 20,1: II 123.  
 20,31: II 127.  
 21,5: I 168.  
 21,12: I 186.  
 21,14-22: I 196.  
 21,26: I 186.  
 22,23: I 189.  
 23: I 29, 129, 130, 180,  
 II 110, 181.  
 23,2ff.: I 180.



24,1f.: II 127.  
 24,2-24: II 128.  
 24,3: I 168.  
 24,15: II 122.  
 25-32: II 124.  
 25,12ff.: II 143.  
 26-33,21: II 126.  
 26,17-18: I 138.  
 27,3-9: I 138.  
 27,26-36: I 138.  
 28,3: II 202, 230.  
 28,12ff.: I 242.  
 28,14ff.: I 242.  
 29ff.: II 127.  
 29,3ff.: I 242.  
 29,17: II 123.  
 29,17-21: II 117.  
 30,10: II 112.  
 31: I 242.  
 32,2-16: I 138.  
 33: II 124.  
 33,21: II 128.  
 33,26: II 112.  
 34: II 124.  
 34-37: II 124.  
 34-48: II 124.  
 35: II 124.  
 35,1ff.: II 143.  
 36,26-28: II 137.  
 36,36,36: II 159.  
 37: I 180, 124.  
 37,1: II 127.  
 37,25: II 112.  
 37,36ff.: I 231.  
 38-39: II 122, 124, 137.  
 38,6: II 134.  
 38,15: II 134.  
 39: II 137.  
 39,2: II 134.  
 39,28: II 137.  
 39,29: II 137, 159.  
 40-48: I 24, 231, II 124, 128.  
 40ff.: I 226, II 69, 70, 126.  
 40,2: II 127.  
 43,5: II 127.  
 44,10ff.: II 69.

44,18: II 66.  
 44,23: I 122, 189.  
 46,27f.: II 112.  
 47,1: II 137.

*Hosea.* 1: I 196, 257, II 131, 132.

1ff.: I 129.  
 1-3: II 130, 131.  
 1,1: II 130.  
 1,1ff.: I 130.  
 1,2: II 130, 131, 132.  
 1,7: II 133.  
 2: II 131, 132.  
 2-4-14: II 130.  
 2,16: II 132.  
 3: I 257, II 131, 132.  
 3,1: II 132.  
 4,12: I 186.  
 4,12b: II 132.  
 5,4b: II 132.  
 5,8-6,6: II 133.  
 5,15-6,3: I 164.  
 6: II 132.  
 6,4-6: I 201.  
 6,6: II 101.  
 7,5: II 130.  
 17,11: II 146.  
 9,7: I 193.  
 9,10-13: I 207.  
 9,10-14,10: II 130.  
 9,15: I 207.  
 11,8-9: II 132.  
 11,11: II 130, 146.  
 12,4: II 132.  
 13,14: II 132.  
 14,2-10: I 200.  
 14,2ff.: II 133.  
 14,5-9: I 158.  
  
*Joel.* 1-2: II 134, 135, 136.  
 1,2-2,17: II 133, 134.  
 1,2-4: II 133.  
 1,5: II 138.  
 1,9: II 136.  
 1,13-14: I 155, II 136.  
  
 1,15: II 35, 134.  
 1,15-20: II 133, 134.  
 1,19-20: II 135.  
 2: II 133.  
 2,1: II 133, 134.  
 2,1-11: II 133.  
 2,2: II 134.  
 2,2-9: II 134.  
 2,3-14: II 137.  
 2,5: II 133.  
 2,10: II 134.  
 2,11: II 134.  
 2,12-14: II 134, 135.  
 2,12-17: I 155.  
 2,15-17: II 136.  
 2,15-18: II 135.  
 2,17: II 134.  
 2,17f.: II 135.  
 2,18: II 134.  
 2,18ff.: II 135, 137.  
 2,18-3,5: II 137.  
 2,19-20: II 135.  
 2,19-27: II 134.  
 2,20: I 196, II 122, 134.  
 2,23: II 133.  
 2,27: II 137.  
 3: II 133.  
 3-4: II 134, 135, 136, 137.  
 3,1: II 137.  
 3,1-5: II 134.  
 3,5: II 133.  
 4: II 133, 134.  
 4,1: II 133.  
 4,1ff.: II 137.  
 4,1-3: II 135.  
 4,2: II 138.  
 4,2f.: II 137.  
 4,6: II 133, 134, 137.  
 4,8: II 133.  
 4,9-14: II 135.  
 4,11: II 138.  
 4,15-17: II 135.  
 4,16: II 133, 140.  
 4,17: II 133.  
 4,18: II 133.  
 4,20: II 133.  
 4,21: II 133.

*Amos.* 1-2: I 176, 203.

1,1: II 139.

1,2: II 140.

1,2-2,16: II 140, 141.

1,9: II 137.

1,9-10: II 141.

1,11-12: II 141.

2,4-5: II 141, 142.

2,10ff.: I 207.

3,1: I 199.

3,1-5,6: II 140.

3,1-6,14: II 140.

3,8: I 194.

3,11: I 91.

3,12: II 143.

4,1: I 199.

4,6ff.: I 207.

4,13: II 141.

5,1ff.: I 180.

5,2: I 137.

5,4: I 201.

5,4-6: I 200.

5,5: II 49.

5,7-6,14: II 140.

5,8-9: II 141.

5,14f.: I 200.

5,14-15: I 200.

5,15: I 201, II 142, 143.

5,16: I 107.

5,16-17: I 135.

5,18: II 140.

5,18-27: I 201, 202, II 101.

5,23: I 152, 202.

6,1: II 140.

6,1ff.: I 199.

6,4-6: I 127.

6,5: I 124.

6,12b: I 98.

6,13: II 140.

7-9: I 253, II 139, 140.

7,1-9,4: II 140.

7,8: I 197.

7,10-17: I 257, II 139, 140.

7,13: I 193.

7,14: II 139.

8,2: I 197.

8,4: I 199.

8,4-14: II 140.

8,14: II 49.

9,1: II 141.

9,1-4: I 41.

9,5-6: II 140, 141.

9,7-10: II 140.

9,8: II 141.

9,10: II 141.

9,11: II 141.

9,11ff.: II 142.

9,11-15: II 140, 141.

9,13: II 142.

9,14: II 142.

9,15: II 141.

*Obadiah.* 1-9+10-14 and

15b: II 143.

1-10: II 117, 144.

2-9: II 143.

2-10: II 143.

8: I 169, II 144, 178.

10: II 143.

15a+16-21: II 143.

16-18: II 143.

19: II 143.

*Jonah.* 2: II 145, 147.

2,10: I 153.

3,3: II 145.

3,6: II 146.

4: I 241, II 146.

4,2: II 144.

4,6: II 145.

*Micah.* 1-3: II 148.

1,1: II 147.

1,1-5a: II 148.

1,2-7: I 192.

1,3-6: II 148.

1,10-16: II 148.

1,14: II 147.

1,15ff.: II 147.

2,4: I 167.

2,11: II 147.

2,12-13: II 148.

3,5-8: II 147.

3,12: II 147, 148, 149.

4: I 242.

4,1ff.: I 152, II 106, 148.

4,1-4: II 148.

4,1-5,8: II 148.

4,6-7: II 148.

5,1ff.: I 148.

5,2: I 196.

5,4-5: II 148.

5,6: I 196.

5,6-7: II 148.

6-7: II 148, 149.

6,1-7,6: II 148.

6,1-8: I 199.

6,6-8: I 164, 189, 201, II 101.

6,7: II 148.

6,16: II 149.

7: I 162.

7,7: II 149.

7,7ff.: I 164.

7,7-20: II 148.

7,8ff.: II 149.

7,8-20: II 148:

*Nahum.* 1: II 151.

1,2: I 150.

1,9: II 150.

2-3: II 151.

2,3: II 150.

2,9: II 150.

2,14: II 150.

3,1: I 196.

3,5f.: II 150.

3,7: II 150.

3,8ff.: II 149.

3,18-19: I 138.

*Habakkuk.* 1,2-4: II 153.

1,5-11: II 152, 153.

1,6: II 152.

1,9: II 152.

1,12-17: I 156, II 152, 153.

2: II 152.

2,1-5: II 153.

2,4: II 152.

2,4b: II 151.

2,6ff.: I 138, 199.

2,6-16+20: II 153.

2,6-19: I 126.

3,1-19: II 153.

3,13: II 152.

3,19: I 151.

*Zephaniah.* 1-2: II 154.

1,1: II 154.

1,2ff.: II 153.

1,4: II 154.

1,7: II 153.

1,8-9: II 154.

1,9: II 153.

1,12: I 168.

1,14: II 153.

2,1: II 153.

2,1-3: I 201.

2,3-15: II 153.

2,4-15: II 154.

3: II 153, 154.

3,3: II 154.

3,8-13: II 154.

3,15: I 151.

*Haggai.* 1,1: II 156.

1,1-11: II 156, 157.

1,1-15: II 156.

1,5-6: II 157.

1,7+9-11: II 157.

1,13: II 155.

1,15: II 156.

1,15a: II 156, 157.

1,15 b: II 156.

2: II 224.

2,1: II 156.

2,3: II 155.

2,10: II 157.

2,10ff.: II 156.

2,10-19: II 156.

2,11ff.: I 188, II 155.

2,12f.: I 202.

2,15: II 160.

2,15-19: II 156, 157.

2,18: II 156, 160.

2,19: II 156.

2,20ff.: II 156.

2,20-23: II 156.

*Zechariah.* 1-6: II 160.

1-8: I 207, 247, 256, 257,

II 156, 157, 158, 160, 161.

1,1: II 157.

1,1-6: II 158.

1,4: I 33.

1,4ff.: I 24.

1,7: II 157.

1,7-6,8: II 158.

2,6: I 196, 197.

3: II 158, 208.

4: II 158, 160.

4,2,5: I 197.

4,4: I 197.

4,6: II 160.

4,6b: I 125.

4,10: II 160.

5: II 158.

5,2: I 197.

6: II 158.

6,1ff.: I 242.

6,9ff.: II 160.

6,9-15: II 158.

6,11: II 131.

7: I 155.

7-8: I 199, II 157, 158.

7,1: II 157.

7,1ff.: I 189, II 188.

7,1-7: I 201.

7,7ff.: I 24.

8,16: I 202.

8,18f.: II 188.

8,19: I 202.

9: II 157.

9-11+13,7-9: II 158, 159.

9-14: I 256.

9,1: II 158, 161.

9,9: I 151.

9,9-10: II 158.

9,10: II 159.

9-11: II 159.

9,13: II 159.

9-14: II 158, 159.

10,6ff.: II 159.

11: II 159, 160.

11,1-3: I 138.

11,4-17: II 158.

11,12-13: II 158.

12-14: II 158.

12-14+13,7-9: II 158.

12,1: II 158, 161.

12,10: II 159.

12,11: II 159.

12,10-14: II 158.

13,2ff.: I 33, II 159.

13,2-3: I 24.

13,7-9: II 160.

14,5: II 139.

14,8: II 159.

*Majachi.* 1,1: II 158, 160.

1,2ff.: II 143.

1,2-5: II 161.

1,6-2,9: II 161.

1,8: II 161.

2,2-3: II 160.

2,10-16: II 161, 162.

2,17ff.: II 161.

2,17-3,5: II 161.

3: II 161.

3,1: II 133, 161, 162.

3,6ff.: II 161.

3,6-12: II 161.

3,13-21: II 161.

3,19: II 161.

3,22-24: II 161, 162.

3,23: II 133.

*The Psalms.* 1: I 141, 160,

161, 174, 175, 254, II 96,

164, 165, 170.

1-41: II 165, 170.

2: I 147, 148, 160, 201, II 138,

164, 165, 170, 239.

2,1: II 202.

2,7: I 160, 215.

2,11 b-12 a: I 98.

2,12: II 168.

4: II 239.

6: I 156.

6,6: I 157.

7: I 190.

7,4: I 158.

7,4f.: I 190.



- 7,8: I 157.  
 8: II 239.  
 8,1: I 150.  
 9: II 164.  
 9-10: I 157, II 164.  
 9,1-9: I 156.  
 9,12: I 151.  
 10: II 164, 165.  
 12,5: I 159.  
 14: I 159, II 165.  
 14,41: II 166.  
 15: I 159, 189, 223.  
 16,7: I 151.  
 18: I 147, 151, II 94.  
 18,1: I 9.  
 19: I 132, II 164.  
 19,8f.: I 150.  
 20: I 147, 159, 160.  
 20,7: I 159, 187.  
 21: I 147.  
 21,1-8: I 156.  
 22: I 90, 156, 158.  
 22,2: I 68.  
 22,5-7: I 157.  
 22,15: I 167.  
 23: I 156, 157.  
 24: I 152, 159, 161, 162,  
 189, 223.  
 24,1: I 150.  
 24,5: I 187.  
 25: I 161, II 164.  
 27: I 157.  
 27,1-6: I 156.  
 27,8: I 159.  
 28: I 147.  
 30,9-11: I 154.  
 31,8: I 151.  
 31,10: I 157.  
 32: I 154, 161, II 174.  
 32,5: I 190.  
 33: I 150, 197, II 165.  
 33,22: I 152.  
 34: II 164.  
 37: I 161, II 164.  
 37,23: I 175.  
 37,35: I 175.  
 38: I 156.  
 39: I 165.  
 40: II 165.  
 41,10: I 182.  
 42-43: I 122, II 164, 168.  
 42-49: I 254.  
 42-72: II 165.  
 42,7-8: II 168.  
 42,11: I 157.  
 44: II 178.  
 44,1-10: I 157.  
 44,14-17: I 157.  
 45: I 125, 129, 132, 147,  
 148, 160, 252.  
 45,3: I 130.  
 45,17: I 133.  
 46: I 122, 150.  
 47,7: I 150.  
 48: I 150.  
 48,2f.: I 242.  
 48,3: II 134.  
 48,15: I 152.  
 49: I 161.  
 49,5: I 167.  
 50: I 143, 160, 161, 165,  
 190, 201, 254, II 232.  
 50,1-7: I 187.  
 50,14: I 153.  
 51: I 158, 161, 165.  
 51,3: I 156.  
 51,15-17: I 158.  
 51,19: I 158.  
 53: II 165.  
 55,13ff.: I 182.  
 56-66: I 256.  
 57,2: I 156.  
 57: II 165.  
 60: II 165.  
 60,8: I 187.  
 60,8ff.: I 159.  
 61: I 147.  
 63: I 147.  
 65: II 142.  
 65,2: I 150.  
 65,14: I 126.  
 66,7: I 152.  
 66,13-15: I 154.  
 66,13-20: I 153.  
 66,20: I 151.  
 68,1: I 140.  
 68,14: II 146.  
 68,26: I 163, 166.  
 69,12: I 157, 167.  
 70: II 165.  
 72: I 147, 148, 160.  
 72,20: I 167, 254, II 165.  
 73: I 154, 161, II 178.  
 73-83: I 254.  
 73-89: II 165.  
 74: II 175, 178.  
 74,8: II 164.  
 74,12ff.: I 157.  
 74,19: II 146.  
 76: I 150, 152.  
 78: I 160, 165, 190, 191,  
 209, II 74, 232.  
 78,2: I 167.  
 79,2ff.: I 76.  
 79: II 178.  
 79,2-3: II 166.  
 80,14: I 56.  
 81: I 143, 160, 161, 165,  
 190, II 78.  
 81,6b. ff.: I 187, 209.  
 81,7: I 159.  
 84: I 150.  
 84-85: I 254.  
 84,2: I 150.  
 85: I 159.  
 85,9: I 159.  
 85,9ff.: I 187.  
 85,11-12: I 180.  
 86,3: I 156.  
 87: I 150.  
 87-88: I 254.  
 87,7: I 124.  
 88,11ff.: I 157.  
 89: I 147, 156, 162.  
 89,10: I 242.  
 89,15: I 180.  
 89,19: I 157.  
 90: II 165.  
 90-106: II 165.  
 91,3: I 159.  
 92: I 150.

- 92,2ff.: I 150.  
 93-103: I 90.  
 95: I 143, 160, 161, 165,  
     190, II 78.  
 95,7ff.: I 209.  
 95,7b ff.: I 187.  
 96: I 77.  
 96,10: I 77, 150.  
 98: I 150.  
 99: I 187.  
 100: I 152.  
 101: I 147, 210.  
 102: I 156.  
 103,1: I 153.  
 104: I 114.  
 104,1: I 151.  
 104,4ff.: I 242.  
 104,34: I 152.  
 105: II 74.  
 105,7: I 151.  
 106: I 160, 209, II 74, 232.  
 106-107: I 165.  
 106,2: I 152.  
 106,48: II 166.  
 107: I 57.  
 107-150: II 165.  
 107,22: I 153.  
 108: II 165.  
 110: I 147, 148, 160, II 138.  
 110,1: I 160.  
 110,3: I 100.  
 110,4: I 216, II 166.  
 111: II 164.  
 112: I 160, 161, 174, II 96,  
     164, 170.  
 113,4: I 151.  
 113,9: II 184.  
 114: II 164.  
 114,1f.: I 150.  
 115: I 150, 151, II 164.  
 115,17: I 157.  
 116: II 164.  
 116,14: I 154.  
 116,17-19: I 153.  
 118: I 162, II 164, 167.  
 118,19-20: I 223.  
 119: I 122, 152, 161, II 164.  
 119,2: I 150.  
 120-134: I 254, II 165.  
 121: I 159.  
 125: I 157.  
 127: I 161, II 165, 170.  
 127,1-2: I 125.  
 128: I 160.  
 128,5: I 188.  
 129,8: I 188.  
 130: I 165.  
 131: I 157.  
 132: I 147, 159, 162, II 58,  
     94.  
 132,8-9: I 223.  
 134,3: I 160, 188.  
 135: II 167.  
 135,5: I 152.  
 136: I 24, 151, II 74.  
 136,3ff.: I 151.  
 137: II 123, 166, 167.  
 137,7: II 143.  
 144,1: I 151.  
 145: II 164, 203.  
 145,13: II 203.  
 147: II 164.  
 147,10: I 131.  
 149,7: I 140.  
 150: I 150.  
 152: I 152.  
*The Proverbs.* 1-9: II 171,  
     172, 173.  
 1-10: I 176.  
 1,1 (2-6): II 171.  
 1ff.: I 255.  
 1,1-6: II 171.  
 1,6: I 178, II 172.  
 1,8: I 173, 176.  
 1,20f.: I 171.  
 1,21: I 181.  
 2: II 172.  
 2,17ff.: II 172.  
 4,1: I 173.  
 7,16: II 172.  
 8: I 151, 165, 172, 180,  
     II 188.  
 8,2f.: I 171.  
 8,22ff.: I 180.  
 9-13: I 180.  
 9,1: I 171.  
 10-22,16: II 172, 173.  
 10,1: II 171, 172.  
 10,1ff.: I 175.  
 10,2 b.: II 172.  
 10,6: I 169.  
 10,6 b.: II 172.  
 10,8 b.: II 172.  
 10,11: I 169.  
 10,11 b.: II 172.  
 10,13 b.: II 172.  
 10,15: I 169.  
 11,4 b.: II 172.  
 11,10 b.: II 172.  
 11,9-12: I 175.  
 11,14: I 169.  
 13ff.: I 180.  
 15,20: II 172.  
 16,10: I 216.  
 16,10-15: I 176.  
 18,11: I 169.  
 19,29b.: II 172.  
 20,19: I 169.  
 21,1: I 216.  
 22,17: II 171.  
 22,17ff.: I 114, 168, II 173.  
 22,17-23,12: II 172.  
 22,17-24,22: II 171.  
 22,17-24,34: II 172.  
 22,28: I 79.  
 23,29f.: I 178.  
 24,23: II 171.  
 24,23-24: II 171.  
 24,23-34: II 171.  
 24,30-34: I 175.  
 25-29: II 171, 173.  
 25,1: I 169.  
 25,1: II 104, 171, 173.  
 25,1-29,27: II 171, 172.  
 25,25: I 173.  
 25,25f.: I 175.  
 26: I 178.  
 26,1ff.: I 175.  
 26,4: I 29.  
 26,4f.: I 175.

26,5: I 29.  
 29,24: I 188.  
 30: I 178, II 171.  
 30-31: II 172, 173.  
 30,1 ff.: I 169.  
 30,1-14: II 171.  
 30,4: I 178.  
 30,6: I 23.  
 30,15-33: II 171.  
 30,18 ff.: I 176.  
 30,21-23: I 176.  
 30,23 ff.: I 176.  
 31: I 176.  
 31,1: II 189.  
 31,1 ff.: I 169.  
 31,1-9: II 171.  
 31,3: II 171.

*Job.* 1-2: I 241, II 175.

1,1: II 178.  
 1,11: I 100.  
 1,21: II 176.  
 2,4: I 168.  
 2,5: I 100.  
 2,9: I 100.  
 2,11: II 178.  
 3,3: I 121.  
 3,4: I 134.  
 4-14: II 174.  
 4,12: I 173.  
 4,12-21: I 186.  
 5,23: I 175.  
 8,4: II 175.  
 11,6: II 177.  
 12,2: II 177.  
 12,9: II 176.  
 12,14-25: II 179.  
 13,5: II 177.  
 15-21: II 174.  
 15,7: I 242.  
 15,8: II 177.  
 15,19: II 179.  
 16,18-19: II 174.  
 19: II 174.  
 19,23 ff.: II 174.  
 19,26: II 174.  
 22: I 182.

22-28: II 174.  
 25-27: II 177.  
 26: II 177.  
 26,3: II 177.  
 26,12: I 242.  
 27: II 177.  
 27,1: I 167.  
 27,23: II 177.  
 28: II 176.  
 28,28: II 177.  
 29-31: II 175.  
 29,1: I 167.  
 29,5: II 175.  
 31: I 182, 190.  
 31,26: II 179.  
 32-37: II 175, 176.  
 33-34: I 82.  
 33,19-40: I 153  
 38-41: II 175.  
 38 ff.: I 151, 165, II 176.  
 38,1-39,30: II 176.  
 38,8 ff.: I 180.  
 38, 13, 15: I 56.  
 40,4-5: II 175, 176.  
 40,6-41,26: II 176.  
 40,15-41,26: II 178.  
 42,1-6: II 175, 176.  
 42,7: II 176.  
 42,7-17: II 175.  
 42,9: II 176.  
 42,17 b.: I 68.  
*5 Megilloth:* I 76.

*The Song of Solomon.* 1,1:  
 II 179.

1,5: II 179.  
 1,5 f.: I 130, 179.  
 1,7-8: I 129.  
 1,7 f.: I 130.  
 1,9-17: I 129.  
 1,9-2,3: I 130.  
 1,12: II 179.  
 1,15: I 130.  
 2,4-7: I 130.  
 2,6-7: II 182.  
 2,7: I 130, II 179.  
 2,8-13: I 130.

2,8-14: I 129.  
 2,14 ff.: I 130.  
 2,14-3,5: I 130.  
 2,15: I 179.  
 2,17 a.: II 182.  
 2,17 b.: II 182.  
 3,1-5: I 132.  
 3,3: I 128.  
 3,7: II 179.  
 3,9: II 179.  
 3,11: II 179.  
 4: I 131.  
 4,1: I 130.  
 4,2: I 130.  
 4,3: I 131.  
 4,4: II 179.  
 4,6 a.: II 182.  
 4,8: I 130.  
 4,12-5,1: I 130.  
 4,13: II 179.  
 4,16: I 130.  
 5,1: I 127.  
 5,1 ff.: I 130.  
 5,2-6,3: I 130.  
 5,7: I 128.  
 5,14: I 131.  
 6,4: I 130, II 179.  
 6,14: I 130.  
 7: I 130, 131.  
 7,1: I 124.  
 7,2: I 131.  
 7,3: I 133.  
 7,5: I 130.  
 7,6: I 130.  
 8,3-4: II 182.  
 8,6: I 130.  
 8,11: II 179.  
 8,12: I 179.  
 8,13-14: I 130.  
 8,14: II 182.

*Ruth.* 2,12: II 184.  
 4,5: II 185.  
 4,6: II 185.  
 4,7: I 210, II 185.  
 4,11: I 129, 132, 134.  
 4,12: II 183.



4,17: II 183.  
4,17b-22: II 183.  
4,18-22: II 183.

*The Lamentations of Jeremiah.* I: II 186, 187.

1-2: II 186.  
1-3: II 186.  
1-4: I 122.  
1,2: I 138.  
1,18: II 187.  
2: II 186, 187.  
2-4: II 186.  
2,7: II 186.  
2,9: II 186, 187.  
3: I 138, II 186, 187.  
4: I 138, II 186.  
4,9: I 130.  
4,17: II 186, 187.  
4,19-20: II 186.  
4,20: II 187.  
4,21-22: II 143.  
5: I 138, II 186, 187, 188.  
5,2-9: II 186.  
5,7: II 187.  
8,6: I 130.

*Ecclesiastes.* 1,1: II 188, 189.

1,2: II 188, 189.  
1,2-11: II 189.  
1,12: II 188.  
1,12-18: II 189.  
1,16: II 188.  
2: II 189.  
2,5: II 190.  
2,7: II 188.  
2,9: II 188.  
2,14: II 190.  
2,19-21: II 190.  
2,26: II 191.  
3,1: II 190.  
3,12: II 190.  
3,16-29: II 190.  
3,17: II 191.  
3,19: II 190.  
4,13: II 190.  
4,13-16: II 190.

5,5: II 188.  
7,1-6: I 175.  
7,16-18: II 190.  
7,25-28: II 189.  
7,26b: II 191.  
7,29: II 188.  
8,5: II 191.  
8,12b: II 191.  
8,14-9,3: II 190.  
9,2: II 190.  
9,3: II 190.  
9,4-5: II 190.  
9,7-9: II 190.  
9,11-12: II 190.  
10,16: II 190.  
10,19: I 127.  
11-12,7: II 190.  
11,9: II 189.  
11,9b: II 191.  
11,9-12,7: I 180.  
12: II 189.  
12,3: II 190.  
12,7b: II 191.  
12,8: II 188.  
12,9: II 188, 189.  
12,9-11: II 189.  
12,11: II 189.  
12,19: II 188.  
13a: II 191.

*Esther.* 3,7: II 193.

4,14: II 194.  
6,1: I 245.  
7,8: II 194.  
9,19: II 194.  
9,20-32: II 193, 194.  
9,21 ff.: I 30.  
10,1-3: II 194.  
11-16: II 231.  
29 ff.: I 130.

*Daniel.* 1: I 238, II 203, 229.

1-3: II 204.  
1-6: II 195.  
1-7: II 195.  
1,1: II 196.  
1,1-2: II 195.

1,1-2,4a: II 203.  
2: I 178, 183, 258, II 195, 198, 199.  
2,1: II 195.  
2,4: II 195, 200, 203.  
2,4b-7,28: II 203.  
2,20-23: I 166.  
2,41: II 196, 202.  
2,41-42: II 196.  
2,41-43: II 196.  
2,43: II 196.  
3: I 166, 238, II 195, 196, 202, 203, 229.  
3,1: II 197.  
3,5: II 164.  
3,5 ff.: II 200.  
3,24: II 229.  
3,24-25: II 229.  
3,26-45: II 229.  
3,31-4,34: II 213.  
3,33: II 203.  
3,46-51: II 229.  
3,52-90: II 229.  
3,72-6,18: II 204.  
4: I 242, II 195, 196, 204.  
4-6: II 204.  
4,1: II 197.  
4,6: II 195.  
4,31: I 150, II 203.  
5: II 196.  
5-6: II 197, 198.  
5,11: II 200.  
5,12: I 178.  
5,20: II 195.  
5,30: II 200.  
6: I 238, II 195, 202, 230.  
6,7: II 202.  
6,12: II 202.  
6,16: II 202.  
7: I 183, 258, II 195, 197, 198, 199, 202, 203, 204, 246.  
7-12: I 247, 259.  
7 ff.: II 243.  
7-12: II 195, 197, 198, 201, 204.  
7,1: II 197.  
7,1-8,27: II 204.

7,28: II 197.  
 8: I 183, 258, II 197,  
     198, 204.  
 8-12: II 195, 197, 203.  
 8,2: II 197.  
 8,5: II 197.  
 8,17: II 197.  
 8,27: II 197.  
 9: I 165, 183, II 162, 197,  
     198, 199, 203, 204, 237.  
 9-12: II 198.  
 9,1: II 198, 200.  
 9,2: I 24, II 197.  
 9,4-19: I 166, II 232.  
 9,4-19: II 232.  
 9,11: II 10.  
 9,13: II 10.  
 10: II 197.  
 10,1: II 197, 198.  
 10,7: II 155.  
 10,16: I 192.  
 11: I 183, II 198, 199, 204.  
 11-12: II 114.  
 11,7: II 196.  
 11,17: II 196.  
 11,34: II 199.  
 11,40: II 245.  
 11,44: II 199.  
 11,49-40: II 198.  
 12,5: II 197.

*Ezra.* 1: II 207, 209, 210.

1-6: II 206, 210.  
 1,1-10,44: II 219.  
 1,2-4: II 206.  
 2: II 208.  
 2,1: II 219.  
 2,2: II 208.  
 2,41: I 166.  
 2,43: II 153.  
 2,55: II 153, 188.  
 2,57: II 188.  
 2,63: I 189, II 208.  
 2,64: II 208.  
 3: II 207, 210, 224.  
 4-6: I 213, II 209.  
 4,1-5: II 156.

4,6: II 207.  
 4,6ff.: II 206.  
 4,6-6,22: II 207.  
 4,7ff.: II 210.  
 4,7-6,18: II 206.  
 4,10-11: I 212.  
 4,12: II 210.  
 4,24: II 219.  
 5,1: II 155, 157, 219.  
 6,14: II 155, 157.  
 7: I 213, II 209.  
 7-9: II 209.  
 7-10: I 247, II 206.  
 7-10+Neh. 8: II 206.  
 7,1: II 208.  
 7,8f.: II 209.  
 7,12-16: II 206.  
 8: I 22.  
 8,14: I 166.  
 8,31: II 209.  
 8,33: II 208.  
 8,36: II 209.  
 9: I 165, 208.  
 9-10: II 209.  
 9,7: I 209.  
 9,9: II 207, 208.  
 10: II 209.  
 10,1: II 208.  
 10,3: II 10.  
 10,9: II 209.  
 10,44: II 205.  
 16: II 209.

*Nehemiah.* 1-7: II 206.

1-13: II 206.  
 2,1: II 208.  
 3: II 208.  
 4,4: I 121, 124, 125.  
 5,14: II 210.  
 5,19: I 247, II 209.  
 6,7: I 24.  
 6,9: I 247.  
 7: II 208.  
 7,4: II 208.  
 7,72-8,13: II 219.  
 8: I 33, II 69, 209.  
 8ff.: I 247, II 209.

8-9: II 209.  
 8-10: I 22, 27, II 209.  
 8,2ff.: II 136.  
 8,3: II 10.  
 8,13ff.: II 38.  
 9: I 165, II 74.  
 9,6ff.: I 209.  
 10: I 210, 211, II 206, 209.  
 10,29: I 211.  
 11-12: II 206.  
 11,17: I 166.  
 12,10-11: II 207, 215.  
 12,16: II 157.  
 12,22: II 207, 208, 215.  
 12,23: I 166.  
 12,26: II 207, 226.  
 12,27-43: I 152.  
 12,47: II 208.  
 13: II 206.  
 13,6f.: II 210.  
 13,13: II 208.  
 13, 14, 22, 31: I 247.  
 13,14: II 209.  
 13,22: II 209.  
 13,31: II 205.

*1st. Chronicles.* 1-9: II 211.

1,3: II 242.  
 2,4-15: II 183.  
 2,6: I 166.  
 3,17-24: II 215.  
 6: II 84.  
 9,1: II 212.  
 10-29: II 211.  
 13: II 65.  
 13,8: I 152.  
 16,3: II 166.  
 18,16: I 171.  
 23,24: II 34.  
 24,16: II 122.  
 29,29: II 212.  
 29,29-30: II 91.

*2nd Chronicles.* 1-9: II 211.

1,3: II 65.  
 2,2-15: II 216.  
 7,20: I 167.

9,29: II 212.  
 10-36: II 211.  
 11,5-10: I 230.  
 11,5-12: II 212.  
 12,15: II 212.  
 13,4-12: I 206.  
 13,4-14: I 140.  
 13,22: II 212.  
 16,11: II 212.  
 18-23: II 212.  
 20,2: I 206.  
 20,6-12: I 208.  
 20,7: I 209.  
 20,13-17: I 184.  
 20,34: II 212.  
 22: II 219.  
 23: II 214.  
 24,20: II 157.  
 24,20f.: I 28.  
 25,1-3: I 166.  
 25,26: II 212.  
 26,5: II 157.  
 26,6: II 212.  
 26,16ff.: II 238.  
 26,22: II 212.  
 27,7: II 212.  
 28,26: II 212.  
 29,34: II 212.  
 30,16: II 10.  
 32,32: II 212.  
 33,12ff.: II 228.  
 33,18: II 212.  
 33,19-9,29: II 212.  
 35,1-36,21: II 219.  
 35,15: I 166.  
 35,19: II 219.  
 35,25: I 145, II 187.  
 35,27: II 212.  
 36,8: II 212.  
  
*3rd Esdras*, 1,21-22: II 219.  
 2,1-14: II 220.  
 3-4: I 178, II 219, 220.  
 3,5: I 178.  
 3,5-7: II 220.  
 4,13: II 220.  
 4,42: II 220.

4,43-46: II 220.  
 5,1-6: II 219.  
 9,55: II 219.  
  
*The first Book of the  
 Maccabees*: I 244, 246,  
 264, II 166, 221, 222.  
 1-2: Macc. I 213.  
 1-9: II 222.  
 2,29-69: I 207.  
 2,49-69: I 191.  
 2,59f.: II 199.  
 3,3-9: I 152.  
 3,37: II 199.  
 3,50-53: I 166.  
 4,30,33: I 166.  
 4,46: I 24, II 159.  
 4,46: II 159.  
 7,11: I 76.  
 7,17: II 166.  
 8,22-32: I 210.  
 9,8: I 206.  
 9,27: I 24.  
 10,44-46: I 206.  
 11,3: II 222.  
 13,2-6: I 206.  
 13,30: II 221.  
 14,6-15: I 148.  
 14,6-25: I 152.  
 14,16: II 221.  
 14,29-47: I 210.  
 14,41: I 24, II 159.  
  
*The second Book of the  
 Maccabees*. 2: II 194, 221,  
 238.  
 1,1-2,18: II 222.  
 1,10-2,18: I 27.  
 1,24-29: I 166.  
 2,2: II 233.  
 2,4f.: II 116.  
 3: II 222.  
 4: II 222.  
 5-15: II 222.  
 6-7: I 238.  
 7: I 240.  
 7,8: II 203.

9: II 222.  
 10,1-8: II 222.  
 11: II 222.  
 11,30: II 199.  
 15,13-16: I 239.  
 15,22-24: I 166.  
 15,36: II 193.

*The Third Book of The  
 Maccabees*. 2,2-3: I 209.  
 2,3-8: I 209.  
 2,20: I 166.  
 6,2-15: I 166, 208.  
 6,4-8: I 209.

*Tobit*. 1,21-22: II 225.  
 3,2-6: I 166.  
 3,11-15: I 166.  
 4: II 224.  
 4,3-19: I 176.  
 7,16: I 210.  
 8,5-7: I 166.  
 13,2ff.: I 166.  
 14,5: II 224.  
 14,10: II 225.

*Judith*. 2-4: II 227.  
 2,28: II 227.  
 4,6: II 227.  
 4,9-15: I 155.  
 9: I 208.  
 9,2-4: I 209.  
 9,2-14: I 166.  
 9,12: I 209.  
 12,7: II 227.  
 12,11: II 226.  
 13,16: II 227.  
 16: II 226.  
 16,1-17: I 166.

*The Song of Azariah*. 3,29-  
 30: II 229.

*Susanna*. 54-55: II 230.  
 58-59: II 230.



*The Book of Baruch.* I, I-4:

II 232.  
 I, 14-3, 8: II 232.  
 I, 15-3, 8: II 232.  
 I, 19-2, 10: I 209.  
 2, 17: II 232.  
 2, 21-26: II 232.  
 3, 9-4, 4: II 232.  
 3, 9-5, 9: II 232.  
 4, 5-5, 9: II 232.

*The Book of Sirach. (Ecclesi.)*

I, 44 ff.: I 172.  
 3, 1: I 173.  
 4, 11 ff.: I 180.  
 4, 15: I 171.  
 6, 32 f.: I 182.  
 7, 36: I 34.  
 8, 7: I 223.  
 9, 9: I 34.  
 9, 15: I 182.  
 11, 28: I 34.  
 13 ff.: I 180.  
 13, 15: I 34.  
 14, 23-24: I 171.  
 14, 20-15, 8: I 166.  
 16 b-22: I 166.  
 16, 24-18, 14: I 166.  
 24: I 151, 165, 166, 172.  
 24, 1 ff.: I 180.  
 24, 23: II 10.  
 32, 4: I 127.  
 33, 1-13 a+36: I 166.  
 38, 24-39, 11: I 170.  
 38, 25: I 125.  
 39, 6: I 172.  
 39, 12-35: I 166.  
 42, 15-43, 33: I 166.  
 44 ff.: I 152.  
 44-49: I 26, II 199.  
 44, 1-50, 24: I 166.  
 44, 16: II 243.  
 46, 11: II 86.  
 47, 2-11: II 216.  
 47, 8-10: II 166.  
 47, 17: II 172.  
 48: II 114.

48-49: I 25.  
 48, 24-25: II 104, 105, 115.  
 49, 9: I 179.  
 49, 10: II 129.  
 50: II 233.  
 50, 27: II 234.  
 51: II 233.  
 51, 1-12: I 166.  
 51, 23: I 171, 182.  
 51, 29: I 171.

*The Wisdom of Salomon.*

I-5: II 234.  
 I, 1 ff.: I 166.  
 I, 1-5, 23: I 208.  
 2, 1 f.: II 191.  
 2, 1-9: I 127.  
 2, 12: I 40.  
 2, 22: II 235.  
 6-9: II 234, 240.  
 6-10: I 180.  
 6, 17-20: II 235.  
 8, 4: II 235.  
 8, 20: II 235.  
 9, 1-8: I 166.  
 9, 15: II 235.  
 10 ff.: I 255, 264.  
 10-19: II 234.  
 11, 22: II 235.  
 12, 12: I 40, II 235.  
 13-15: II 235.  
 14, 16-17: II 236.

*The Letter of Aristaeas.* § 30:

I 81.  
 § § 31 ff.: I 81.  
 § 183-300: I 178.

*The Book of Jubilees.* 4, 17-

19: II 237, 243.  
 5, 1-14: II 237.  
 10, 13: II 243.  
 21, 10: II 243.  
 31, 13-20: II 237.

*Martyrium Isaiae.* 1: II 238.

1-5: II 238.

I, 1-2 a: II 238.  
 2, 1-3, 12+5, 1 b-14: II 238.  
 3, 13-4, 18: II 238.  
 6-11: II 238.  
 6 b-13 a: II 238.

*The Psalms of Salomon.*

3, 12: II 239.  
 8, 1: II 239.  
 9, 4: II 239.  
 11, 2-7: II 232.  
 13, 11: II 239.  
 14, 9-10: II 239.  
 17, 7: II 239.  
 17, 31: II 239.  
 18, 10: II 239.

*The Fourth Book of The Maccabees.* I 208.

I, 11: II 240.  
 5 f.: I 238.  
 6-7: II 240.  
 6, 29: II 240.  
 8-12: I 238.  
 12, 21-22: II 240.  
 14, 6: II 240.  
 18, 23: II 240.  
 19, 9: II 241.

*Enoch.* 1-5: II 243.

6-11: II 237, 243.  
 6-39: II 243.  
 12, 3: I 173.  
 12-36: II 243.  
 15, 1: I 173.  
 30, 13: II 244.  
 37-71: II 243.  
 38-69: II 243.  
 39, 1-2 a: II 243.  
 46, 2 ff.: II 243.  
 48, 3: II 243.  
 51, 4: II 244.  
 54, 7-55, 2: II 243.  
 59, 1-2: II 244.  
 60: II 243.  
 61, 4: II 244.  
 62-63: II 243.

62,1: II 244.  
 65,1-69,25: II 243.  
 69,26 ff.: II 243.  
 70-71: II 243.  
 72-82: II 243.  
 81-182,4a: II 243.  
 83-90: II 243.  
 83-84: II 243.  
 85-90: II 243.  
 91-105: II 243.  
 91,12-17: II 243.  
 93,1-14: II 243.  
 93,1-14+91,12-17: II 243.  
 106-8: II 243.  
 106-107: II 243.  
 108: II 243.

*The Assumption of Moses.*

6,1: II 245.  
 7: II 245.  
 7,1: II 245.

*The Fourth Book of Ezra.*

1-2: II 247.  
 3-14: II 246.  
 4,23: I 28.  
 4,33: I 40.  
 5,5: I 40.  
 6,7: I 40.  
 8,47: II 247.  
 10,60 ff.: II 247.  
 10,60-12,51: II 246.  
 12,10-12: II 199.  
 13,1-58: II 246.  
 14,1-48: II 246.  
 14,18-48: I 26.  
 14,21-23: I 28.  
 15-16: II 247.

*The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch.* 9,9: II 248.

48: I 166.  
 54: I 166.

*The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch.* 1: II 248.

4: II 248.  
 6-8: II 248.

*Matthew.* 2: I 240.  
 4,1: II 127.  
 4,10: I 186.  
 5: I 175.  
 5,18: I 47.  
 9,23: I 135.  
 12: I 84.  
 12,18-21: I 82.  
 12,39 ff.: II 147.  
 12,40: II 146.  
 16,14: II 116.  
 20,28: I 57.  
 21,42: I 20.  
 23,35: I 28.  
 27,9: I 34, II 158.  
 27,46: I 68.

*Mark.* 1,1: II 161.  
 8,33: I 186.  
 10,19: II 52.  
 12,26: I 50.  
 13,33: I 18.  
 15,34: I 68.

*Luke.* 1: I 150.  
 1,68-79: I 134.  
 2,29 ff.: I 134.  
 2,34: I 134.  
 3,26: II 234.  
 4,1: II 127.  
 4,23: I 168.  
 8,48: I 186.  
 11,49: I 34.  
 18,13: I 156.  
 18,20: II 52.  
 20,42: II 164.  
 24,44: I 26, 28, 32, II 162.

*John.* 4,25: II 9.  
 7,38: I 34.  
 19,37: I 90.

*Acts of the Apostles.* 1,19:  
 II 234.  
 1,20: I 164.  
 2: I 191.

2,16 ff.: II 134.  
 7: I 56, 191.  
 8: I 172.  
 9 ff.: I 172.  
 13,6 ff.: I 172.  
 13,33: II 164.  
 19,13 ff.: I 172.  
 20: I 207.

*Rom.* 1,17: II 151.  
 3,19: II 161.  
 5,3-5: II 235.  
 9,19-23: II 235.  
 9,22: II 235.  
 11,2: I 50.  
 11,4: I 100.

*1 Cor.* 2,9: I 34.  
 15,32: I 127.  
 15,54: I 90.  
 15,55: II 132.

*Gal.* 3,11: II 151.  
 3,15-29: II 77.  
 3,19 ff.: II 77.

*Eph.* 4,4: II 102.  
 5,14: I 34.

*2 Tim.* 3,15: I 20.  
 4,13: I 44.

*Hebr.* 9,3 ff.: I 56, 82.  
 10,38: II 151.  
 11,37: II 238.

*The Letter of James.* 5,4:  
 I 125.

*Jude.* 9: II 244.  
 14-15: II 242.  
 14-16: I 34.

*Apoc. John.* 1,1: I 260.  
 9,1-12: II 134.  
 10,9 ff.: I 251.

17,5: I 180.  
22,18f.: I 23.

1 *Clem.* 27,5: I 40.  
55,3-6: I 40.

*Epistle of Barnabas.* 12,1:  
I 40.

*Mishnah. Ednyoth V.* 3: I 30.

*Megillah* IV, 4: I 48.

*Pirke Aboth* I, 3: I 34.

II, 5: I 34.

III, 2: I 32.

III, 4: I 52.

(*Shabbath X VI, I*): I 20.

*Yadaim* III 5: I 20, 29, 30.

IV, 5: I 61, II 7.

Bab. Talmud. *Baba bathra*  
13b: I 48.

14b: II 10, 81, 82, 86, 104,  
129, 130, 135, 183, 187.

14b-15a: I 25, 26, 32,  
II 174.

15a: II 91, 97, 116, 186,  
187, 205.

21a-b: I 62.

134a: I 71.

*Baba qamma* 92b: I 34.

*Haggiga* 13: I 29. II 7.

13a: II 124.

*Jebamoth* 49b: II 103.

*Megillah.* 3a: I 69, 71,  
II 155.

7a: I 29, 30.

70d: I 31.

74d: I 69.

*Menahoth.* 45a: II 124.

*Sanhedrin.* 21b: I 47.

103b: II 103.

*Shabbath.* 13b: II 124.

30b: I 29.

115a: I 68.

115b-116a: I 57.

Jerus. Talmud. *Ta'anith*  
IV,2: I 51.

Tosefta. *Sanhedrin XII*: I 30.,

XII: I 128, II 7, 180.

*Mahzor Vitry*: I. 63.



## CONTENTS

Preface.....	5
--------------	---

### THE CANONICAL BOOKS

THE LAW .....	9
<i>Parts and Contents</i> .....	9
<i>Authorship</i> .....	10
The traditional View .....	10
<i>Attempts towards a Solution of the Problem of Composition</i> .....	12
The History of Pentateuchal Criticism .....	12
<i>The Documentary Hypothesis, its Basis and its Methods</i> .....	24
<i>Characteristics of the Strata</i> .....	32
The "Priestly" Complexes (P).....	32
The Code of Holiness (P <sub>h</sub> ).....	37
Other peculiar sections of P.....	38
Remodellings of P.....	39
Deuteronomy (D).....	39
The "Yehovistic" Parts of the Pentateuch.....	44
The legal Material of JE.....	52
The Decalogue .....	52
The Book of the Covenant.....	55
Ex. 34.....	57
Gen. 49 and Deut. 33.....	57
<i>Material outside the Strata</i> .....	59
<i>The end of the Documentary Hypothesis?</i> .....	60
<i>The Age of the "Sources"</i> .....	63
<i>The Combination of the Strata</i> .....	71
<i>The Law and the following Books of The Old Testament</i> .....	72
<i>The Pentateuch as Religious Document</i> .....	76

THE PROPHETS .....	81
Prophetae priores.....	81
<i>The Book of Joshua</i> .....	81
Contents of the Book.....	81
Authenticity and Structure.....	82

<i>The Book of Judges</i> .....	86
Name and Contents.....	86
Composition.....	78
<i>The Book of Samuel</i> .....	91
Name and Contents.....	91
Composition.....	91
<i>The Book of Kings</i> .....	96
Name and Contents.....	96
The traditional Authorship, and the Structure of the Book.....	97
Prophetæe posteriores.....	101
<i>The Book of Isaiah</i> .....	103
The Name of the Book.....	103
The Contents.....	103
Authenticity.....	104
Isaiah II and Isaiah I.....	104
Isaiah I.....	107
The Problem of Trito-Isaiah.....	109
The Servant Songs.....	110
The Composition of the Book.....	113
<i>The Book of Jeremiah</i> .....	115
The name of the Book and the Prophet.....	115
Contents.....	116
Authenticity.....	117
Composition.....	118
<i>The Book of Ezekiel</i> .....	122
The Name of the Book and the Prophet.....	122
Contents.....	123
Authenticity.....	124
The Composition of the Book.....	125
Did Ezekiel prophesy in Judæa?.....	127
<i>The Dodecapropheton</i> .....	129
<i>Hosea</i> .....	130
The Prophet.....	130
Contents.....	130
Authenticity and Integrity: The Marriage of the Prophet.....	131
<i>Joel</i> .....	133
Name and Contents.....	133
The Problem of the Book.....	134
Authenticity and Integrity.....	135
The Date of the Book.....	135
<i>Amos</i> .....	139
The Prophet.....	139
Contents and Composition.....	140
Authenticity and Integrity.....	141
<i>Obadiah</i> .....	143
<i>Jonah</i> .....	144

Contents.....	144
The Prophet.....	144
Authenticity.....	145
Integrity.....	145
The Date.....	145
Historical Character of the Book .....	145
<i>Micah</i> .....	147
The Prophet.....	147
Contents and Authenticity.....	148
<i>Nahum</i> .....	149
<i>Habakkuk</i> .....	151
The Name of the Book.....	151
Composition and Date.....	151
Contents.....	153
<i>Zephaniah</i> .....	153
Contents.....	153
The Prophet.....	153
The Date.....	154
The Book.....	154
<i>Haggai</i> .....	155
The Prophet.....	155
Contents of the Book.....	155
Authenticity and Integrity.....	156
<i>Zechariah</i> .....	157
The Prophet Zechariah.....	157
Contents.....	158
Authenticity.....	158
Integrity.....	160
<i>Malachi</i> .....	160
The Name of the Book.....	160
Contents.....	161
Date.....	161
<i>The Prophets as Religious Document</i> .....	162

THE HAGIOGRAPHIA .....	163
<i>The Psalms</i> .....	163
The Name of the Book and its Contents.....	163
Prehistory of the Collection .....	165
The Date of the Book and its Subdivisions.....	166
The Dating of the individual Poems.....	166
The Authors .....	169
The technical Terms.....	169
Song-Book of the Temple – Book of Edification.....	170
<i>The Proverbs</i> .....	171
Name and Contents of the Book.....	171
Composition and Authenticity.....	171
The Date.....	172



<i>Job</i> .....	174
Name and Contents.....	174
Integrity.....	175
Tendency.....	177
The Poet and his Time.....	178
<i>The Song of Solomon</i> .....	179
History of Interpretation.....	180
<i>Ruth</i> .....	182
Contents.....	182
Position in the Canon.....	183
Integrity.....	183
Tendency.....	183
Date.....	185
Historical Character.....	185
<i>The Lamentations of Jeremiah</i> .....	186
The Name.....	186
Contents.....	186
Position in the Canon.....	187
The traditional Theory of Authorship.....	187
The Place in Life.....	187
<i>Ecclesiastes</i> .....	188
Name.....	188
Composition and Contents.....	189
Date.....	190
Integrity.....	191
<i>Esther</i> .....	192
Contents.....	192
Unhistorical Character of the Book.....	192
Date.....	193
Integrity.....	194
The Religious Character of the Book.....	194
<i>Daniel</i> .....	195
The Legends.....	195
Their Independence and their Interdependence.....	195
Their Integrity and their traditional Date.....	196
The Visions.....	197
The Date of the complete Book.....	198
The Problem of Pseudonymity.....	200
The Home of the Author, and the Traditions embodied in Dan.....	201
Integrity of the Book. The Change of Language.....	202
Position of the Book in OT Literature.....	203
The Septuagint Text of Daniel.....	204
<i>Ezra and Nehemiah</i> .....	205
The Composition.....	206
<i>The Chronicles</i> .....	211
Name and Contents.....	211
Sources of the Work.....	211

The Historiography of the Chronicler.....	213
The Date.....	215
<i>The Hagiographa as a Religious Document</i> .....	216

## APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA ..... 218

### THE APOCRYPHA..... 219

3rd Esdras.....	219
The first Book of the Maccabees.....	221
Contents.....	222
Integrity and Date.....	222
<i>The Third Book of the Maccabees</i> .....	223
<i>Tobit</i> .....	223
Name and textual Transmission.....	223
Contents.....	224
Date and Home of the Book.....	224
The Material of the Book.....	225
Integrity.....	225
<i>Judith</i> .....	226
Contents and Historicity.....	226
Date.....	226
Transmission.....	228
<i>The Prayer of Manasses</i> .....	228
<i>The Additions to Daniel</i> .....	229
Survey.....	229
The Song of Azariah and of The Three Men.....	229
Susanna.....	230
Bel and the Dragon.....	230
<i>The Additions to Esther</i> .....	231
<i>The Book of Baruch</i> .....	231
Contents.....	231
Date.....	232
<i>The Epistle of Jeremiah</i> .....	232
<i>The Book of Sirach</i> .....	233
<i>The Wisdom of Solomon (Sapientia Salomonis)</i> .....	234

### THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA..... 236

<i>The Book of Jubilees</i> .....	237
<i>Martyrium and Ascension Isaïac</i> .....	238
<i>The Psalms of Solomon</i> .....	239
<i>The Fourth Book of the Maccabees</i> .....	240
<i>The Sibylline Oracles</i> .....	241
<i>Enoch</i> .....	242
<i>The Assumption of Moses</i> .....	244
<i>The Fourth Book of Ezra (or: 2nd Esdras)</i> .....	246
<i>The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch</i> .....	248
<i>The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch</i> .....	248
<i>The Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs</i> .....	249

<i>The Life Adam and Eve</i> .....	249
<i>The Apocalypse of Abraham</i> .....	250
<i>The Testament of Abraham</i> .....	250
THE OLD TESTAMENT AND AFTER.....	251
INDEXES.....	253
<i>Names</i> .....	253
<i>Quotations</i> .....	270



## APPENDIX

### *Additions to Vol. I.*

*Page 9, in the note:* cf. also *Irwin*, in *ZATW* 1950, pp. 1 ff. — A contemporary of *Lyra* was *Simon Atumano* (cf. *Burkitt*, in *The Legacy of Israel* (see II, p. 253) (p. 93). — Hebrew was taught at the university of *Frederick II* in Naples in the 13th century (*ibid.* p. 216). Among other scholars from the Middle Ages who worked on the OT are *Roger Baco* (*ibid.* pp. 271 ff.); *Raimundus Lullus* (*ibid.* pp. 273 ff.). — *Miss Smalley's* book has appeared in a new edition in 1951. —

*Page 10:* As representatives of humanistic learning in the field of Hebrew studies should also be mentioned *Reuchlin* and *Pico della Mirandola*.

*Page 12, line 9:* A middle position is taken by *Augusti*, (*Grundriss einer hist.-krit. Einleitung im AT* (1806); cf. *Noth*, *Geschichte und Gotteswort im AT* (1949), p. 6).

*Page 17, note 2:* *Pfeiffer's* Introduction was published anew in 1952. I have not seen it. Concerning the arrangement of a history of literature, see also the introductory chapter of *Lods*, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive*, esp. p. 20. His contention that the traditional element is not so great in the later ages, in prophetic books, *Job*, *Eccl.* etc., seems open to criticism, according to the work of most recent years.

*Page 19, in the note, at the end:* *Lods's* book is a History of Literature and therefore includes much material outside the Bible, such as the *Jehoiachin* tablets, the *Nippur* business documents, the papyri of *Elephantine*, *Jewish Pseudepigrapha* under the name of *Greek Philosophers*. If this wide framework should be filled completely, also the works of *Philo* and *Josephus* and the NT writings should be included (cf. *Rowley*, op. cit.). But that would probably have meant a too great extension of the book. — *Lods's* work is a fine and indispensable book which, with its many fine descriptions of the literature and its well selected bibliography, supplemented by the editor, *Parrot*, can be of great use to modern scholars. It is not so "old fashioned" as people generally believe when they hear that a book of this kind represents the *Graf-Wellhausen* position. For it is more than that. It is, in reality an attempt to combine the old "Introduction" with *Gunkel's* history of literature. It works on the line of the "*Gattungsforschung*" to a great extent, especially in the first part, on ancient poetry. In this respect it is a parallel to *Hölscher's* work, mentioned below in the additions to vol. II, pp. 61 ff. on Pentateuchal Criticism. *Lods's* chapter on the *early narratives* and *oral tradition* may also be mentioned in this connection. The two recent works tell us how much has already been done before the literature of the last 10 years began to make oral tradition its main interest and sometimes the clue to practically all riddles. Such works are the foundation of our work.

*Page 24, line 1:* Similar imprecations and benedictions as those in *Hammurapi's* code are found also in the earlier *Lipit-İstar* Law-code.

Page 26, line 9: In collecting the Holy Books the Jews at first did not seem to distinguish very much between the text-forms adopted. A very *ancient list* (from the time of the synod of Jamnia?) studied by Audet (*Journ. of Theol. Stud.*, 1950, pp. 135ff.) gives — in transcription — names of the books both in Hebrew and Aramaic forms, indicating that the collection here catalogued contained Targums alongside with Hebrew scrolls.

Page 42ff. On *problems relating to the writing of Hebrew* the important work of G. R. Driver, *Semitic Writing* (1948) (The Schweich Lectures of 1944) should be consulted *passim*. Cf. also Ira Maurice Price, *The Ancestry of our English Bible. An Account of Manuscripts, Texts and Versions*, 2nd edition, ed. by W. A. Irwin and A. P. Wikgren (1949), and B. J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (1951). On the *Alphabet*, cf. Diringers comprehensive work *The Alphabet* (1947), cf. the review by Albright, in *Modern Language Notes*, 1949, pp. 182ff. On the *Sequence of the Letters* (the "ABC"), Albright, in *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, April 1950, pp. 12ff.; Oct. 1950, pp. 23ff., on a Ras Shamra tablet found in Nov. 1949; Speiser, *ibid.*, Febr. 1951, pp. 17ff.; see also Eissfeldt, in *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 1950, cols. 216ff. — Further, Henri Cazelles, in the art. *Sémitique occidentale*, I, groupe du Nord et dialectes dérivés: Les Écritures, in *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement*, cols. 284—317 (on the languages, Février, *ibid.*). On the enigmatic *Byblia Grammata*, the pseudo-hieroglyphic Script of Byblos, see Diringers, *The Alphabet*, pp. 158ff.; 205ff.; Lods, *Histoire de la litt. hébr.*, pp. 154f. and 1036.

Page 47, line 17: On the *Nash Papyrus*, see II, p. 52, note 1. It must be kept in mind that the earlier photographs of the papyrus are unreliable (*Lacheman*, *Jewish Quarterly Review* (1949), pp. 15ff.; Kahle, *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (1951), p. 7, cp. plate 10.

The question of the date of the papyrus has been of importance in the discussion concerning the "*Dead Sea Scrolls*". Only a few of these new manuscripts have been published, by Sukenik in two Hebrew volumes, *Megilloth Genuzoth* I (1948), II (1950), and by Millar Burrows, John C. Trever, and W. H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* I (1950), II, 2 (1951). — While the scepticism concerning the *genuineness* of the scrolls now seems to have vanished, the discussion of their *age* is still going on, and it does not seem advisable to be too emphatic on this matter. A very early date, ca. 150 B.C. — 200. A.D. is advocated by many scholars, and many also prefer the earlier parts of this period. On the other hand, G. R. Driver and others assume a date *after* 200 A.D. Readers are referred to the comprehensive bibliography in Kahle, *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (1951), and to the



excellent reviews of *Baumgartner* in *Theol. Rundschau* 1948-49, pp. 329-246 and 1951, pp. 97-154, cf. *Theol. Zeitschr. Basel* 1951, pp. 391 ff. Later than these bibliographic works appeared G. R. *Driver*, *The Hebrew Scrolls from the Neighbourhood of Jericho and the Dead Sea* (1951); *Analecta Lovanensia Biblica et Orientalia*, Ser. II, Fasc. 22, containing G. *Vermes*, *La Communauté de la Nouvelle Alliance*, and J. *Coppens*, *Les Manuscrits du Désert de Juda* (1951); S. *Mowinckel*, *Håndskriftfunnet ved Dødehavet og dets betydning for teksthistorien*, *Norsk Teol. Tidsskrift* 1951, pp. 145 ff.; *Hempel*, *ZDMG* 1951, pp. 138 ff.; cf. also many passages in *The OT and Modern Study*, ed. *Rowley* (1951). A very clear example of premature inferences is singled out by *Kahle* (op. cit. pp. 62 ff.). Important contributions have been made by A. *Dupont-Sommer*, esp. *Observations sur le Commentaire d'Habacuc* (1950) and *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (1950), Engl. transl. by *Margaret Rowley*, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (1952); cf. also *Parrot's* addition and bibliography in *Lods*, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive*. *New important discoveries* have been announced in *The Manchester Guardian*, April 7, 1952. *De Vaux* is reported to have withdrawn his date of the jars and his contention that they were made expressly for the purpose of containing the scrolls (cf. below).

Even if the latest date in antiquity were accepted (concerning the Mediaeval date by *Zeitlin* and others, cf. *Millar Burrows*, in *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 1951, pp. 105 ff.) the manuscripts of *Isaiah* found among this precious lot of antiquities would be of great importance. When it has been said that they only contain few and irrelevant deviations from the normalized Massoretic Text and accordingly attest the very early existence of a holy and immutable text, this has, on the other hand, been disproved by closer inspection. *Materially* they contain the Hebrew text known to us, but not what must, strictly speaking, be called the *Massoretic Text*. And that was only what we had to expect. Concerning *textual criticism sensu stricto* they also give evidence to what we had to expect, namely that there are numerous minor deviations of the kind also found in other traditions of ancient literature, aberrations conc. orthography and phraseology (well illustrated by *Lindblom*, *Svensk Teol. Kvartalskrift* 1950, pp. 302 ff.; *ZATW* 1951, pp. 235 ff.; and in *Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund* 1950-51, vol. II). Especially the assertion that the MSS have done away with the theories conc. the Massoretic Text and its early history found in the writings of *Kahle* must be regarded as completely unfounded. We refer to *Kahle's* own refutation of such assertions in *Die hebr. Handschr. aus d. Höhle*, to his contribution the *Festschrift für Friedrich Nötscher* (1950), pp. 129-136, and to *Mowinckel's* article in *Norsk Teol. Tidsskr.*



Both in the case of the *Papyrus Nash* and the *Dead Sea Scrolls* I should prefer not to give a too emphatic verdict conc. the date. A vague indication, like "about the beginning of our era", would best express my present feeling.

*Father de Vaux's* withdrawals (cf. above) have made the *very early date* on archaeological grounds more uncertain. The new discoveries seem to give the cautious remarks of *Parrot* (in *Lods*, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive*, pp. 1031 f.) a sort of confirmation: That the concealment of the manuscripts took place in connection with the *Jewish war* between 66 and 70 AD. Some evidence seems however also to point to connections with the insurrection of *Bar Cochba* under *Hadrian*. At least, *Parrot's* doubts concerning the archaeological date of the jars seem to have been justified. The arguments from the contents must be taken more into consideration – cf. the works of *Dupont-Sommer*, and *H.-J. Schoeps*, *ZATW* 1951, pp. 252 ff. What makes a decision difficult is – as far as I can see – that all arguments are till now based upon different instances, all of some uncertainty. The *palaeographical* arguments suffer from the scarcity of relevant material for comparison. The *archaeological* arguments have proved not quite so certain as first assumed when the pottery was pronounced definitely Hellenistic. The *radio-carbon* process is not so decisive as it has been maintained, owing to the comparatively wide margins with which we have to reckon. And even the *historical* allusions found in the texts – of which I find *Dupont-Sommer's* best founded – will also necessarily be speculative to a certain, and not a small degree.

– Concerning *the scrolls and the question of the fixing of a "holy and untouchable text"* at an early date, see also *Vriezen*, in *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 1952, pp. 98 f. *Vriezen* here makes the same inferences concerning the fluidity of the consonant-text as *Kahle* and *Mowinkel*. "Indien de bekende nieuwe Jesajarol, die gedateerd wordt vanaf 150 v. Chr. tot 70 na Chr., uit de eerste eeuw vóór of na het begin onzer jaartelling zou zijn, staat hierme vast, dat in die periode de bijbeltekst van de profetische boeken nog niet zonder meer sacrosanct kan heten. De kanonisering van de profetische geschriften, die reeds lang achter de rug moet zijn (Jesus Sirachs lijst!) houd dus niet een volstreekte onveranderlijkheid in." *Vriezen* also – with approval – quotes *Baumgartner's* a little impatient words (*Theol. Rundsch.* 1951, p. 144) on "all dieses Gerede von einer "Bestätigung des MT"" – On the other hand, *Vriezen* rightly criticizes the use of the term "vulgar texts" ("Vulgärtexte") by *Kahle* and others, because this term leads to the idea of *degenerate* texts. The different texts are not "degenerate" but examples of texts backed by learned traditions in different schools of traditionalists. – Pp. 100 f. *Vriezen* gives an important sketch of the manner in which the Bible was read in the circles of Jews behind

the *Discipline Manual*, the *Habakkuk-Scroll*, and the new *Hymns of Praise* and of the importance of this for our understanding of the interpretation of the Bible in early Christianity.

The most "sensational" parts of the new scrolls are not the Bible-manuscripts, but the documents of the "sect" which give us a vivid picture of a Jewish religious movement, probably the same as that known from the "Damascus-Fragments" and – as *Schoeps* points out (*ZATW* 1951, pp. 249 ff.) – from the *Psalms of Solomon*. The identification with the *Essenes*, by the way, should not be stressed too much. *Lindblom* says cautiously (*Sydsvenska Dagbladet*, May 4th, 1952) that if the documents should be Essene they must come from Essene circles different from those known from the sources which we have till now had at our disposal (cf. also *Vriezen*, op. cit., p. 101: "toch wel niet Essenen"). That they are not *Ebionites* (*Teicher*, in *Zeitschr. f. Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*, 1951, pp. 193 ff.) has been shown by *Schoeps* (op. cit.). *Schoeps* advocates a date like that given by *Dupont-Sommer*.

Whether *form-critical investigations* of the non-Biblical scrolls should furnish material for the *dating* of the Scrolls will be considered later (cf. addition to *Page* 203 ff.).

– A special problem is presented by the *fragments of texts in Old Semitic characters*. They have recently been investigated by *Février* (in *Journal Asiatique* 1951, pp. 275 ff.) who compares them with earlier inscriptions (Siloam, Lakish-letters, Maccabaeen coins) and ancient Samaritan script, and concludes that their script seems to be a little earlier than the earliest Maccabaeen forms, or perhaps from the same age. Further, the writing of the Dead Sea Scrolls seems to be a little earlier than the time when Samaritan script began to develop its own characteristics. On these presuppositions, *Février* thinks it safe to place the *palaeo-Hebrew fragments* in the *second century B. C.*

*Eissfeldt* has published a very useful list of variants in the Isaiah- and Habakkuk MSS, for the *Biblia Hebraica* of Kittel (*Variae lectiones rotulorum manuscriptorum Anno 1947 prope Marc Mortuum repertorum ad Jes. 1-66 et Hab. 1-2 pertinentes*, 1951).

*Page* 49, note 1: cf. *Steuernagel*, p. 41. According to a letter to me from Professor *L. Pap* (April 1951) the library in Budapest possesses a *Bible of Stephanus* from 1557 with complete numbering of verses.

*Page* 51, note 1: Concerning the *Temple Scrolls*, see literature listed by *A. Spiro*, Samaritans, Tobiads and Judahites in *Pseudo-Philo* (1951), note 26, cf. also note 16, and below, Appendix to Vol. II, p. 7.

*Page* 87, linie 23. The Twentieth Century Edition of *Sabatier's Vetus Latina* by the *Erzabtei Beuron* began to be published in 1949, on a very large



scale. The first fascicle only contains Sigla and Abbreviations. In 1951 *Genesis* began to appear.

Page 95, in the § on *Textual Criticism*. The difficulties regarding the finding of an "Urtext" were already seen by Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber* (1864), pp. XIIIff., quoted by Widengren, *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets* (1948), p. 32, note 3. Widengren presents important observations leading to views similar to those of Kahle, that a fixed "Urtext" has never existed. The normalized texts are a result of the work of scribes; cf. also Mowinckel, *Norsk Teol. Tidsskr.*; 1951, p. 162; The books of the prophets have in many cases from the beginning existed in different forms, both materially and formally. *Oral tradition* assumed different shapes, which were fixed in written form. Later the work of "normalization" set in. This is proved by the different forms of Jer. and Prov. and other books in the MT and the LXX: These two forms descend from different types of tradition which were normalized, and only one form was authorized.

Page 102ff. Among the literature concerning *Oral Tradition* the reader should not miss J. van der Ploeg. *Le rôle de la tradition orale* (Rev. Bibl. 1947, pp. 5-11), often quoted by Widengren in his *Aspects of the Hebr. Prophets*.

Page 107, note 1: On the significance of Num. 21,13-15 and 21,27-29 as evidence for early written transmissions, see Lods, *Histoire de la litt. hébr.*, pp. 22ff.

Page 117, line 6: Concerning the *Ras Shamra Parallels*, see also vol. II, p. 167, n. 3. — Albright's essay on Ps. 68 is as usual brilliant and stimulating. But his lack of understanding for the significance of Mowinckel's work has — in this case — led him into a contribution to the interpretation of Ps. 68 which is in reality a measure of desperation furnishing a fresh example to the collection in Reuss, "Der achtundsechzigste Psalm: ein Denkmal exegetischer Noth und Kunst" (1851). This contribution is, however, of great value because of its many references to *Ugaritic*. It is quite clear that Ugaritic Literature and its parallels to Hebrew Poetry have not yet been exhausted. More and more we discover how Psalm Literature — like Wisdom Literature — is "international". Israel must have taken over much more of ritual phraseology from the Canaanite sanctuaries after the settlement in Canaan. It is here that Mowinckel's understanding of the Psalms as *ritual* poetry helps us to explain the situation. For *ritual* is a great conservative factor. The immigrants had to learn — from the Canaanites — how to till their land. But to this teaching and learning would also belong the *rites* necessary to secure fertility, and the sacred *words* to be pronounced and sung at the harvest-festivals and on other occasions important for agricultural work. Israel entered the "successio apostolica" of Canaanite



religion. Not until later they discovered the difference between their God and Baal and that they had to break the succession. But even that break did not do away with the language preserved by rituals.

Much of the Ugaritic material used as linguistic criteria for dating the Psalms in the article of *Albright* will however have to undergo the test of future discussion. But *Albright* is probably right in stressing that it is strengthening the tendency of our times to place many poems in and outside the Psalter in an earlier age than we did half a century ago. The question of *Maccabaeans* *Psalms* in the Bible is out of date. The question of *pre-monarchical* and even *pre-Israelite Psalms* in Israelite edition is coming in. But it must also be said that even if e.g. *Ex. 15* should be proved a psalm from the 13th century this does not prove its Mosaic origin, but only the *possibility* of early Israel having taken over and re-cast pre-Israelite psalms, like the taking over of legal material and working it over to serve Israelite ends. At present too much stress is often laid upon possibilities. We ought very often to be reminded of the old rule, not to draw inferences *a posse ad esse*.

Page 123, line 19. On the risks of a too rash denial of the existence of "*profane literature*" in the OT cf. also *Lods*, *Hist. de la litt. hébr. et juive*, p. 14, where, however, at least the reference to Ps. 45 is most inappropriate. The allusion in Ez. 33,32 to the "singer of love songs" can be taken as evidence for the existence of "profane", i.e. not cultic, love songs. But probably the forms of such songs will have been the same as those used in connection with *hieròs gámos*-rites, the songs being, accordingly, in some cases "profane", in others "ritual". Again, therefore, the line of demarcation between "religious" and "profane" becomes uncertain.

Page 125. On the religious character of Num 21, 17-18, see also *Lods*, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive*, pp. 41 ff. *Lods* thinks that this poem is a prayer addressed to a holy well, and a *hymn* in praise of it. In favour of this view he quotes several Arab parallels.

Page 130: Concerning the *metaphors* used, see *Waterman*, JBL 1925, pp. 179 f., quoted by *Rowley*, *The Interpretation of the Song of Songs* (Journ. Theol. Studies 1937, pp. 337 ff.; re-issued in *The Servant of the Lord and other Essays* 1952; our quotation is from the latter book, p. 210, n. 5). *Waterman's* words seem to reveal some lack of understanding for the strange culture of the East; but it has well underlined *how* strange the metaphors very often are to us.

Page 131 f. – On the rights and wrongs of the *cult-mythological* interpretation see also *Rowley* (in *The Servant of the Lord* etc. pp. 213-232).

Page 135: On the *funeral songs*, see the detailed description in *Lods*, *Histoire*, pp. 59 ff.

Page 139, note 4. On *Jos. 10, 12–13* see the words of *Lods*, so full of real understanding for the poetry of the fragment which must not be defiled by the clumsy hands of orthodox rationalism (*Histoire de la littérature hébraïque*, p. 24f.). *Lods* reminds of the sublime poetic parallel in the *Odyssey*, 23, 243–246.

Page 166, line 16: The “hymns” contained in the *Dead Sea Scrolls* both in the *Hymn Scroll*, from which *Sukenik* has published some specimens, and in the *Discipline Manual*, published by the Americans, exhibit the same *stylistic features* as the material hitherto known. The *Benedictions and Curses* (cf. below, to page 188) are set in a clear liturgical context in the “Manual”. The other poetic elements of this scroll seem to be used as descriptions of wrong and right manner of living. The description of the *unrighteous man* who may not enter the Holy Community (DSD III, 1 ff.) reminds of the picture of the *enemies in the Psalms*, but also of the evil men in *Wisdom literature*. Similarly VIII, 5b–8 describes the Holy Community in terms of the sacred priesthood, reminding of Ps. 133, but also of the Zion Hymns (Pss. 48, 76, 84, 87, 122) and of “Liturgies d’Entrée” like Ps. 15 and its parallels. The long poetical section beginning in IX, 24 starts with a description of the bliss of the righteous and with injunctions to bless God. From X, 1 on we have the beginning of a hymn which responds to this injunction. This could at least be interpreted as an *imitation* of a liturgical situation (cf. I, 18–20; II, 10ff.). The beginning of the Manual upon the whole describes the “cult” of the Community, and this circumstance might give some justification for the assumption that X, 1 is more than a formal imitation. The concluding hymn, X, 156ff., has a superscription (cf. *Brownlee’s* translation, BASOR, Suppl. Studies 10–12, 1951, p. 45) describing the liturgical “place in life” of the poem. *Brownlee* (op. cit., p. 53) gives a brief description of “The Yearly Covenanting of the Sect” to which the liturgy of I and II belongs, and supposes that it took place on the *Festival of the Jewish New Year* or on the *anniversary* of the foundation on the Community.

Page 171, line 14: On the scribe *Shaphan* and his family, see *Hölscher*, *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel* (Lund 1952), pp. 188ff.

Page 174, note 1: The Cuneiform Literature uses the same ideogram for “priest” as for “scribe” even in Neo-Babylonian times (G. R. Driver, *Semitic Writing*, p. 62, n. 4).

Page 176, note 4. When *Eduard Nielsen*, *Dansk Teol. Tidsskr.* 1952, p. 104 says that it is difficult to assume another cause of origin for the *acrostic poems* than the mnemotechnic interest, his words need some limitation. The “magic” ideas connected with the alphabet must certainly also be taken into account (cf. the later Cabbalistic speculations (see *The Legacy of Israel*, p. 326; S. A. Hirsch, *The Cabbalists* (1922), pp. 18, 29, 30). – On *Classical alphabetic magic*, see *Dieterich*, *ABC-Denkmäler*, Kl. Schriften 1911, pp. 202ff. = Rhein.



Mus. Ph. LVI, 1901, pp. 77 ff. – *Dornseiff*, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*, 2nd ed. 1925. – A warning against a premature use of a “magic” interpretation of the letters and the alphabet has, on the other hand, been voiced – concerning the *Teutonic runic* script – by *A. Bæksted*, *Målruner og Troldruner* (Nationalmuseets Skrifter, Arkæologisk-Historisk Række, IV, København 1952) – a fine example of sober and sound interpretation which can be read by theologians with great profit, as a manual of sound methods of interpretation.

Page 181, note 5: As a “philosophical conversation” one might rather label the discussion on the justice of God and the guilt of men in *Gen. 18,22–33* – cf. *Lods*, *Histoire de la litt. hébr.* pp. 311 ff. On p. 313 *Lods* uses the title “dialogue philosophico-théologique” of this section.

Page 181, line 8: see note to Vol. I, pp. 203 ff. on *prose forms in the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

Page 185, note 4. Rowley’s article is now reprinted, in fully up-to-date form, in *The Servant of the Lord and other Essays*, pp. 91 ff.

Page 188, line 13 ff. – *The Aaronitic Benediction* is found in the so-called “Discipline-Manual” among the *Dead Sea Scrolls* in a remarkable variant (DSD, II, 3 ff. – Transl. by *Brownlee*, BASOR, Suppl. Studies nos. 10–12 1951): “May He bless thee with every good, and keep thee from every evil; and illumine thy heart with life-giving wisdom, and favour thee with eternal knowledge; and lift up His face of mercy toward thee for thine eternal peace”. (cf. *Vriezen*, *Nederl. Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1952, p. 101, on the significance of this text for the understanding of the use of the text by the Jews in NT times).

Page 188, line 19: An example of *curses* is found in the *Discipline Manual* immediately after the benediction just quoted. It contains some lines turning the Aaronitic Benediction into a curse (DSD, II, 9):

“May He lift up His face of anger for the vengeance due thee,  
and mayest thou have no peace  
at the mouth of all who hold enmity!”

The Benediction and the Curse here supplement one another in a liturgical situation like that behind the 28th ch. of Deuteronomy – cf. the form of Beatitudes and Curses in the Lucanic rendering of the Sermon on the Mount, and *Mowinkel*, *Psalmenstudien* V.

Page 200: cf. *Février*, *Rev. de l’hist. des Religions*, 1952, p. 21, on a Punic inscription (Cherchell I) where the root *šmr* (in the Niphal) is used in a similar religious sense (in line 5 of the inscr.).

Page 203 ff: *The Prose of the Dead Sea Scrolls* exhibits a *mixture of styles*. A type not found in Biblical literature is the *Commentary* on a Biblical book, represented by the *Habakkuk-Scroll* and a fragment of Ps. 107, (cf. *Baumgartner*, *Theol. Rundschau* 1951, p. 152). Its most characteristic formal feature is dealt with by *Eissfeldt* in his article on *Die Mene-tekell-Inschrift* in *ZATW* 1951, pp. 105 ff. On the *Habakkuk-Commentary* cf. also *H.-J. Schoeps*, in *ZATW*



1951, p. 250. – The *Discipline-Manual* should as a whole be regarded as a sort of “*Law-Book*”. But it uses several styles. The first line of the American edition (which is not the beginning of the manuscript – see Baumgartner, loc. cit. – and which is not complete) seems to be a sort of superscription found in other places in the manuscript (V, 1; VI, 24; VIII, 20; IX, 12, 21), but also resembles sentences of the same significance in Deuteronomy and P-Sections of Gen.-Num. The following chapters describing the liturgy of the Covenant are related to descriptive parts in the later strata of the Law (on the poetic sections, see Appendix to pp. 166 and 188). – Col. III, 13 ff. follows (after a superscription similar to the first mentioned) a description of man’s nature. Here IV, 1 ff. recalls sections of NT letters, e.g. Gal. 5, 19–23 and similar catalogues of virtues and vices (cf. also Rom 1, 31). They are modelled upon parallels in the writings of the *Stoics* and are therefore in our texts evidence for the influence of *Hellenistic style* on *Wisdom Literature* (cf. Vol. I, p. 181), espec. from the *Diatribē* – see Lietzmann to Rom. 1, 31 (pp. 35f), but also Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 4th ed. 1923, with examples from more popular circles showing what had influenced not only philosophical schools, but the public of ancient society in the broadest sense. This means that the prose of the *Discipline-Manual* is most related to late *Wisdom Literature* in prose, where the sentential style disappears. We have a *fusion of the parenetic style of Deuteronomy and the Law of Holiness and the late Hellenistic prose of Wisdom*. – In the description of the practice of the Community the *legal style* is preserved in a sort of *categorical, apodeictic commandments* (e.g. V, 7 ff.). – VI 24 ff. brings a real piece of Law, and we have also here examples of the *hypothetical, casuistic legal style*. We also find several instances of superscriptions of legal collections, cf. above. – The *Discipline-Manual* thus shows a typical example of the mixture of styles of later and latest ages.

The above observations are of course only first-glance results. But I have the impression that closer inspection will upon the whole confirm them. Whether this form-critical sketch could furnish a starting point for the *dating* of the manuscripts must of course be considered. The *prose* of the *Discipline-Manual* seems to point to rather strong Hellenistic influence. It is decidedly later than *Sirach*, and on the other hand I think there is some affinity to the Hellenistic writings like *Sapientia Salomonis* and the NT letters. Taken together with the attempts e.g. by Dupont-Sommer to date the texts by means of their *contents* and supposed allusions to events of history this should lead to a dating of these texts *about the beginning of our era*. But this not unexpected result will be seen again to be a vague determination. It does not furnish a strict *terminus ante quem*. Here the traces of connection with the two

Jewish wars against the Romans (ca. 70 and 130 AD; cf. *the Manchester Guardian*, April 7, 1952, p. 4) are of importance. – It ought to be noted that a *dating on form-critical criteria*, like a dating by means of contents, would primarily help to date the *texts*, not the *copies* found. Supposing that the manuscripts of non Biblical texts do not contain originals we must assume that the manuscripts are later than the texts. In so far I think that the vague indication given above: later than Sirach, akin to Sapientia and the NT, should be a *warning against a too early dating of the manuscripts*.

Page 210, note 4. *Genealogies*. The forms of genealogies deserve a special chapter. The stylistic analysis would have to start in the many ways of *enumeration*, exhibited by the extant collections of genealogical lists. 1 Chron 1 ff., e. g., contain a curious mixture of ways of recording the sons of a patriarch. Such an investigation will serve as a help to separate the independent units.

But also their contents are of importance. Are they "real" genealogies, i. e. lists of fathers and sons, their marriages etc.? Do they contain material concerning more than relations by blood, or are their unions of men and their wives and their common issue also significations of political and sociological relations, tribal connections, alliances between nations and towns? Do they describe the divisions of an urban population into different sorts of trade, arts and crafts? Can the lists be connected with cult and ritual, e. g. with the amphiptyonic sanctuaries, as one of their "places in life"?

A monograph is needed. The works mentioned in the note are meant as a starting point. To the list of *literature*, add Hölscher, *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel* (Lund 1952, pp. 47f.; 75; 126f.).

Page 217: *Lods*, *Hist. de la litt. hébr.*, pp. 209 ff. defends the idea of D. H. Müller "d'une loi sémitique primitive qui aurait servi de prototype commun aux diverses législations orientales en même temps qu'à l'une au moins des sections de la loi romaine des XII Tables". But I cannot see that he has invalidated the conclusions stated in my first edition.

Page 221, note 5. – Concerning "laymen's catechisms" cf. also Oxyrynchos Papyri, Gött. gel. Anzeigen 1918, nr. 3-4, p. 113, "Zusammenstellung einer Zehnzahl der wichtigsten für den Laien bestimmten Kultgebote" (quoted by Hölscher, *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel* (Lund 1952), p. 166).

Page 232, in the *literature on laws* (line 14). On the laws of Lipit-Ištar and Bilalama, cf. Parrot, in *Lods*, *Hist. de la litt. hébr.*, p. 1037 (to p. 209); Klíma, in *Archiv Orientální* XIX, 1951.

Page 234f., in the *list of Literature on Narratives*, add. also: Hölscher, *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel* (Lund 1952), pp. 60-98.

Page 244f. On the *history of David* in 2 Sam. see the fine description in *Lods*, *Histoire de la litt. hébr.*, pp. 160 ff. *Lods* describes the "genre" of this story as

"ni une chronique officielle, ni une histoire populaire, anecdotique de David: il appartient au genre des *mémoires*" (p. 164).

Concerning the *aim* of the story-teller, *Lods* is embarrassed by the strict "objectivity" of the author. He supposes, at length, that the only interest which made him tell the story was his patriotism and his love of the epoch of Israel's national greatness, but also his feeling that the great work had been destroyed by the faults of David and the cruelty of Solomon. This comes very near to the ideas of *Hölscher*, that the aim of the Yahwist (J) is to prove that the despotism of Solomon led to the disruption of his empire (*Geschichtsschreibung in Israel*, p. 116, and already in *Die Anfänge der hebr. Geschichtsschreibung* (1941-42) - cf. my *Det sakrale kongedømme* (1945), pp. 120, 124, and 127).

Page 248, note 3: Against the theory of *Abiathar* as author of the "story of succession after David" *Lods* rightly underlines that *Abiathar* was a partisan of *Adoniah* against *Solomon*, but the author of 1 Ki. 1 is evidently an enemy of *Adoniah* (1 Ki. 1,5) (*Hist. de la litt. hébr.*, p. 167, cf. *Hölscher*, *Geschichtsschreibung*, p. 95).

Page 248, line 8: *Hölscher*, *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel. Untersuchungen zum Jahwisten und Elohisten* (Lund 1952).

Page 255, line 25. On the literary character of *Wisd.*, see App. to vol. II, p. 234, l. 30ff.



*Additions to Vol. II.*

*Pages 12 ff.*: To the additions made in the text I here add some references to literature, for which I have found no suitable place. First I shall point to some papers bringing parallels to my own presentation of *the History of Pentateuchal Criticism and its present state*.

In the American volume, *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, there is a survey by R. A. Bowman, mostly on the lines of pre-war ideas and without much attention to form criticism. A supplement in this respect is offered by G. Ernest Wright, in a paper on Recent European Study in the Pentateuch, in *The Journal of Bible and Religion*, October 1950, pp. 216 ff. Wright deals especially with the work of von Rad and Noth. The Swedish points of view he does not discuss. This is done briefly and satisfactorily by G. W. Anderson, in *Some Aspects of the Uppsala School of Old Testament Study*, published in *Harvard Theological Review*, October 1950, pp. 239 ff. On pp. 253-256 he gives a report on the sketch of Pentateuchal Problems in Engnell, *Gamla testamentet*, I. He postpones his final judgment till the publication of the 2nd volume of Engnell's book, and limits himself to some general remarks which are, however, very much to the point. He admits that "considerations concerning the characteristics of Hebrew narrative style and the like may call for a modification of accepted views". But he adds that "they hardly indicate their demolition". Such factors, and the influence of oral transmission, may make it "impossible to indulge in the clear-cut analyses which characterize many essays in criticism". But he underlines - rightly - that "the main structure of the Wellhausen theory was so firmly grounded in historical as well as literary evidence that its destruction demands not merely arguments but a commentary". A good introduction to the Uppsala-School is also found in Schrey, *Theol. Zeitschr. Basel* 1951, pp. 321 ff. The most detailed work I have seen comes from the pen of C. R. North, who has contributed an important essay to the volume edited for the Society of Old Testament Study by H. H. Rowley, *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (1951). North surveys the history of criticism since Hölscher's works on Deu-

teronomy in the beginning of the twenties. Like *G. W. Anderson*, *North* can read the Scandinavian languages and so has access to much material which most scholars must leave untouched, at most relying on reports from others. And his personal connections with Scandinavian scholars has put him in the extraordinarily happy position that he has seen even unpublished material, such as articles in the 2nd volume of *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk* which was not published until 1952, but so late that I could not use it. This means that *North* has been able to give a full and authoritative description of the views of the Uppsala school. His criticism, therefore, must be characterized as the best founded in existence till now. I cannot reproduce it in extenso here, but must refer readers to personal study of the *opus laudatum*.

*North* admits that on the modern view of the Pentateuch we cannot – in the manner of earlier criticism – regard the story told in the Books of Moses simply as legend with a nucleus of history. “There is much to be said for the view of *Pedersen* and *Engnell* that the story of the Exodus is a cultic glorification, and that the only “history” we can extract from it is history in very broad outline, not history in any precise detail.” *North*’s subsequent, very condensed remarks on the idea of “Heilsgeschichte” must be read.

*North* next expresses a feeling of uneasiness when looking at the way in which the material from the Pentateuch is used in describing Old Testament religion. He misses “dimensional depth” in the historical picture. He wants to be able to discover what is early and what late in the stories. Without some sort of documentary theory that seems impossible. “It seems clear” – he says – “that if we bury the “documents”, we shall have to resurrect them – or something very like them”. He then points out that both *Pedersen* and *Engnell* recognize different kinds of material. “*Engnell*... puts D in a category by itself. He grants that the “tradent(s)” of the “P-work” were responsible for a quantity of “special “P-material”” which corresponds “in a very large measure” to the P of literary criticism. What remains must be the JE of literary-criticism, since there is little that the critics leave outside their JEP scheme. *Engnell* even goes so far as to concede that something corresponding to separate “J” and “E” strata may once have existed, but says that they were already so fused together at the stage of oral tradition that it is now hopeless to try to disentangle them”.

In this connection *North* advances some points of view similar to those offered by *Lindblom* concerning the similarity between written tradition and oral tradition, when the latter is described as having all the fixity of the former (cf. above, Vol. I, p. 105). *North* rightly infers that in principle there would be nothing wrong in the application of literary-critical methods to it. He

supposes that "*Engnell's* circles of traditionists... have left traces of their activities during the centuries they were at work". After some very pointed remarks on this subject *North* concludes that "what *Engnell* denies is obviously not *sources*, but *parallel sources of considerable length*". Against this *North* points out that "if there were different circles of traditionists, and if" they "handled not only units but *collections of tradition*, it is not inconceivable that the Pentateuch will be found to contain something like parallel 'documents', whether 'oral' or 'written'. "There can be no possible objection in principle to parallel sources even at the pre-literary stage".

This brings *North* to the question of the *constants* (cf. above Vol. II, pp. 26 ff.). Here, he says, *Engnell* "overplays what in some ways was quite a good hand". *North* lays his finger on the curious feature "that anyone in Uppsala, of all places, should say that 'the LXX shows inescapably that the variation in the divine names must to a large extent be the result of a later process of unification'" — and then he points to "*Skinner's* crushing reply to *Dahse*" (in *The Divine Names in Genesis*) as final also in the case of *Dahse's* modern followers. *North* has — in fact — pointed out that if the attack (on the parallel sources hypothesis) fails, we are left in some sort where we were.

I shall not follow *North's* lines farther. They are, in the main, my own (cf. Vol. II, pp. 62 ff., to which *North* refers). What is interesting is that *North*, as said above, works on material unknown to me when I wrote the first edition of this book, notably *Engnell's* article on "Moseböckerna" in S. B. U. II. I had not expected such a fulfilment of my prediction of the "resurrection" of the Documentary Theory (cf. above, Vol. II, pp. 62 f.) as that which *North* seems to have found in his material (cf. *North*, pp. 77 f.).

What *North* says concerning the Divine Names as a "constant", p. 79 f., also applies e. g. to the remarks of *Kapellrud*, in Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts (1952), p. 46. K. simply ignores that Psalms and Poetry like the Ras Sh. Texts cannot be compared with prose stories and that the Divine names do not alternate in the same way in the Psalms and in the stories. In the latter they are the same in longer paragraphs, they do not vary much inside the units. — And I think that my position is not shaken by the remarks of *Bea* (*Biblica*, 1951, p. 278). For he does not suppose — as the Uppsala scholars do, or at least as *Engnell* does — that oral tradition is just as fixed as written. Oral tradition can go on for a long time parallel to written literature, and they may also influence one another. But the point when a text is declared definitive and unchangeable is reached much earlier, than *Bea* supposes. This of course only applies to the *material* form of the text, as the Dead Sea Scrolls show. They do not exhibit the Massoretic Text, formally (cf. above, addition to vol. I, p. 47, line



17). But concerning the contents there is no essential deviation. We have evidence for a more pliable description of the immutability of holy texts in the formula, first found in Israel in Deut. 4,2, cf. 5,22, 12, 32, but probably much older, as the elaborate use of the same thought in the concluding part of Cod. Hammurapi shows. In this respect the arguments of *North* concerning the use of the Divine Names (op. cit., pp. 79f.), with reference to the unshakable testimony of *Skinner's* investigations, are also of importance. I do not think that we find a real doctrine on the unchangeability of the letters of the Biblical text much earlier than the time of Rabbi *Akiba* (cf. above, Vol. I, p. 69 and *Vriezen's* words in *Nederlands Theol. Tijdschr.* 1952, pp. 98ff.). *Josephus*, it is true, bears witness to the idea of the immutability, at least materially, of the Holy Text. He quotes the formula of Deut. 4,5 (Ant. I, 17; cf. IV, 196; cf. *Schlatter*, *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus* (1932), pp. 64ff., on the discrepancies between his maintenance of this formula and his own "interpretation" of the Scriptures; see also *B. J. Roberts*, *OT Text and Versions*, p. 20). He owned himself scrolls of the Holy Texts, given to him by Titus out of the booty taken in Jerusalem, probably in the temple (cf. *Schlatter*, op. cit., p. 103, note 1). To his formularium in quoting the Bible belongs also that the Scriptures quoted are found in the Temple (Ant. III, 38; cf. IV, 304; V, 61), or in the native land of the Jews (Ant. VIII, 159), cf. the passages quoted by *Hölscher* in *Pauly-Wissowa's* article on *Josephus*. This means that he reproduces the idea of the *special authority attached to Scrolls of the Temple*, also known from the tradition on the scroll saved in 70 A. D. (cf. above, I, p. 51). But the free use of the text in *Josephus* is probably due to his use of traditional material outside the Bible (cf. *Hölscher*, op. cit.), which perhaps can be characterized as a degenerate form of oral tradition. And his references to temple scrolls then will mean that he is aware of this, but tries to bolster up the authority of this tradition by means of Scripture. *Josephus* accordingly confirms the fact noted by *Bea*, that oral and written tradition may run parallel for a long time. But he also confirms that the authority of the latter is considered most decisive. And so it will have been for centuries, as the formula in Deut. 4 shows.

I regret that space will not allow me to enter in detail upon the interesting questions put to me by another friendly Roman Catholic reviewer of my book (*Coppens*, in *Bibliotheca Orientalis Nov.* 1950, and in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, Jan. 1950(?)). It is quite true that I am inclined to give the material handed down in Genesis a special position. I think there is much truth in the theories referred to above, Vol. II, pp. 20ff. cf. p. 60, giving the traditions of Genesis materially an originally independent position. I here

follow the lead of *Johs. Pedersen*, *Galling*, and *Engnell*, quoted in the appended notes. The *Patriarchal stories in Genesis* are originally, at least a great part of them, *immigration-traditions*, belonging to other parts of the ethnic groups, which in Palestine were mingled with one another, and so formed the people of Israel especially under the religious influence of those other groups, which under the leadership of Moses and Joshua represented the distinctly Yahwistic trend in Israel's history. The patriarchal traditions have later been connected with those embodied in Ex.-Num. (cf. II, p. 21). The question of the relations between the theory of E and J as a product "d'un seul auteur" and the idea of "cycles cultuels" belonging to certain festivals, I should answer by underlining that I do not connect these "cycles cultuels" *directly* with the present form of the Pentateuch, but with the material *behind* e. g. the "Passover Legend" Ex. 1-15 (cf. II, p. 21 and my remarks in *Det sakrale kongedömmet*, p. 15, note 2-3, and above, on *Kapelryd's* ideas in Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts; cf. also my description in JBL, 1948, pp. 30ff. and *Ringgren* on Gen. 1-3 in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1948). The "troisième remarque", on the "fil rouge" combining the stories in JE, I am not sure that I understand. I should readily admit that the thread between the stories sometimes is "tenuis". But I think it is there, even if it, in some places, must be called "un simple fil rédactionnel". And lastly, it is quite right that there is a great "antinomie" between the "ethnic" material of P and the more recent parts. That it is *too* great I think may of course be a matter of feeling. But when we know how very ancient ritual customs live on and on through ages, e. g. also in our churches, but still are used by men and women of high intellectual culture, I think that the combination cannot have been impossible in P. The question of "de-mythologization" may have been a problem to some people then as now. — When I speak of an "Hexateuch" it does not mean that I disapprove the views of *Noth* and *Engnell*. On the contrary. And my use of the term must be regarded as being of a more or less formal character. But I also have underlined that there seems to me to be some truth in the term "Hexateuch", c. II, pp. 75ff. (see further on *Hammershaimb's* review of *Engnell*, below to page 16, n. 2).

Next, I supplement my biographical notes by referring to professor *Copen's* valuable contribution to the history of scholarship, on which he is a distinguished authority, through his publication of the work of *van Hoonacker* on the Pentateuch: *A. van Hoonacker, De compositione Litteraria et de origine Mosaica Hexateuchi disquisitio historico-critica. Een historisch-kritisch onderzoek van Professor van Hoonacker naar het ontstaan van de Hexateuch op grond van verspreide nagelaten aantekeningen samengesteld en ingeleid door Jozef Coppens* (1949).



Further, reference should be made to a change in Roman-Catholic attitude, cf. the letter from *Jacques Vosté* to Cardinal *Suhard*, in *Biblica* 1948, pp. 165 ff. – and to some other recent works on the subject of Pentateuchal Criticism.

My own *Bemerkungen über neuere Entwicklungen in der Pentateuchfrage*, in *Arch. Orientální* XIX, 1–2, pp. 226 ff., cf. *Poznámky k novějším řešením otázky Pentateuchu*, in *Theologia Evangelica* II, Praha 1949, were written at the time of the publication of the first ed. of this book and represent its views. Later is my article in Danish in *Illustreret Religionsleksikon* II (1950) on “*Mosebøgerne*” (some parts of which were written by Mr. *Svend Holm Nielsen* and Mr. *Preben Wernberg-Møller*).

On *Lods*'s *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive*, see above, App. to Vol. I, p. 1.

Only just before these additions had to go to the press I received the latest work of *Gustav Hölscher* on the Pentateuchal Problems: *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel, Untersuchungen zum Jahvisten und Elohisten* (*Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanist. Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund*, vol. L, 1952). It is a continuation of the book mentioned in Vol. II, p. 19, note 9, but revised and enlarged so as to embrace a detailed investigation of J and E.

In an *Einleitung* *Hölscher* briefly refers to the views of *Johs. Pedersen*, *Nyberg*, *Birkeland*, *Engnell*, and *Noth*. He energetically repudiates their scepticism concerning coherent sources of considerable length – to use *North*'s expression (cf. above, p. 15). He analyses in great detail the two sources, points out similarity and differences. He underlines the importance both of theological, political and other material peculiarities, but also that of style and language, for separating the two works, and he shows that a fairly good coherent history can be found in each case. He underlines, however, several times that the two old sources are so much alike, but also so strongly woven into one another, that a clear-cut separation in several cases cannot be effected.

*Hölscher*'s work is a restatement of the powerful arguments in favour of the Documentary Hypothesis, those arguments which are often skipped with too much levity by the modern antagonists. On the other hand, although the work is mainly a work of literary criticism, it has not left the modern views aside. In its investigation of the *material* used by J and E *Hölscher* gives a view of the “pre-literary” traditions which is his contribution to History of Traditions. His chapters on “*Stoff und Gestaltung*” of J and of the “*Quellen*” of E are masterly contributions to the understanding of the life of legend in oral tradition as pre-suppositions of the strata. Like *Lods*, *Hölscher* has a great deal more understanding for the traditio-historical points of view than many seem to know, and, in fact, can give his own positive solution of the problems.



He assumes of course a great amount of oral tradition in the form of single legends and cycles of legends, and he gives a brilliant picture of the way in which the material is bound together by means of genealogical material.

On many points opinions may of course differ. I should e.g. emphasize the significance of *oral* transmission in the genealogical material more strongly. And I think that the manner in which E's dependence upon J is shown, by means of replacing the different sections in order to prove an original sequence in J used by E, is a very weak point in the book. But it is a book which cannot be brushed aside as a *quantité négligeable*. It is not only a powerful statement of the literary critical position. It is also an attempt at a solution which should be taken seriously into account by those who have their eyes open to other ideas as those of the 20th century. It will perhaps in some quarters be called a compromise and a half-measure. But name-calling is of no avail.

It should also be noted that in his treatment of literary criticism as the books stand now *Hölscher's* view represents a simplification. He has given up the idea of two Yahwists, J<sup>1</sup> and J<sup>2</sup>, and in adherence to *Mowinkel* thinks that we have to find E in the parts formerly assigned to J<sup>2</sup> (*Lods*, *Hist. de la litt. hébr.* pp. 174f. still assumes the plurality of J: J<sup>1</sup>, J<sup>2</sup>, J<sup>3</sup>).

*Page 11, note 1.* On the enigmatic phrases of *Ibn Ezra*, and their probable meaning, see *Lods*, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque*, pp. 86f.

A contemporary of *Hobbes* was the Calvinist nobleman *Isaac de la Peyrère*, the founder of the *Praeadamitic theology* (*Systema theologicum ex praeadamitarum hypothesi, pars prima* (1655-anonymous); *Praeadamitae, sive Exercitatio super versibus XII, XIII et XIV capitis V epistolae B. Pauli ad Romanos quibus inducuntur Primi Homines ante Adamum conditi* (1655-anonymous)). *De la Peyrère* is the first who raised the question of the unity of the Pentateuch. He was imprisoned by the Inquisition and his book was burned by the executioner (*Lods*, *Histoire de la litt. hébr.*, p. 89).

*Page 13, note 5.* Among the predecessors of *de Wette* concerning the theory of Deuteronomy and its connection with Josiah's reform should also be mentioned *Voltaire* whose interest in Biblical matters has been described in an article in *ZATW* 1906, pp. 398ff. and 494ff. (cf. *Lods*, *Histoire de la litt. hébr.*, p. 92).

*Page 16, note 2.* On the relations between *Wellhausen* and *Hegel*, see the dissertation of *F. Boschwitz*, *Julius Wellhausen, Motive und Massstäbe seiner Geschichtsschreibung* (Munich 1938), cf. my note in *Theol. Rundschau* 1948-49, pp. 327f. Perhaps it should be discussed whether *Wellhausen's* construction of the history of Israel's religion - which was the most vulnerable point in his work (cf. *Buhl*, *Die israelitische Volks Historie*, 7th. ed. by *Johannes Jacobsen*, 1937, pp. 11ff. and earlier editions) - has not been more influenced by that mixture of Positivism and Evolutionism which was characteristic of the later part of the 19th century. But see, as a comment on this fact, the words of *Lods*, *Hist. de la litt. hébr.*, p. 113. -

An example of *unnecessary dissolving of original units* is - in my eyes - the dissection of the benediction of Isaac, Gen. 27,27b-29, as presupposed by *Lods*, *Hist. de la litt. hébr.*, pp.

50f. Even if the narrative part of Gen. 27 should be composite it seems unadvisable to cut up the poetic parts in the same way. – In this connection it is worth noting that *Wellhausen* (*Composition des Hexateuchs* (1899), pp. 33 f.) limits himself to note some inconsistencies in the narrative, but refrains from giving verdict on a separation of sources. And characteristic of *S. R. Driver's* literary tact is that he considers the whole of ch. 27 as belonging to J (his Commentary in the Westminster series, cf. his Introduction, p. 16, where he refers to the separation of sources in ch. 27 but declares it doubtful whether the grounds alleged are decisive). *Pfeiffer* (Introduct. p. 273), referring to the usual separation, rightly says that "the poem seems to be a unit and may be older than either document; it is by the same author who wrote the corresponding curse on Esau. . . which is later than the conquest of Edom by David but earlier than Edom's successful revolt under Jehoram" (cf. also *Lods*, p. 51); one might add, and older than the revolt against Solomon. *Pfeiffer* concludes, "Since J and E are closely interwoven in Gen. 27, it is no longer possible to determine with assurance whether the last two poems constituting the climax of the story were originally a part of J or E".

– On the other hand I should like to add a reference to *Hammershaimb's* review of *Engnell's* *Gamla testamentet I*, in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1949. He refers to pp. 268 ff. where *Engnell* gives an interpretation of Gen. 27, 23 ff. *Hammershaimb* admits that the repetition of the words "and he blessed him" is no proof of the existence of two sources. But he criticizes *Engnell's* view that the verbal form *wajebârêkû* (imperf.) has a different meaning in the two passages where it occurs. V. 25 ff. only tells something which was not pointed out the first time (concerning *Engnell's* understanding of verbal tenses in Hebrew, see also *Nyberg*, in *Sakkunnigutlåtanden angående ledigförklarade professorsämbetet i exegetisk teologi i Lund* 1947, pp. 13 f. and 16).

On *Engnell's* remarks against *Hammershaimb* (*Gamla testamentet I*, loc. cit.) is to note that neither the latter nor I have used Gen. 27 in our description of the arguments for the composite character of Genesis – probably on account of our knowledge of the discord among the critics alluded to in this note.

Page 17, note 5: On *Cassuto's* theory, see *Lods*, *Hist. de la litt. hébr.*, p. 99.

Page 26, line 2. The *Story of the Deluge* is one of the most obvious examples in proof of a "Documentary Hypothesis" – see the treatment in *Lods*, *Histoire de la litt. hébr.*, pp. 103 ff. und 305 ff. – It is generally supposed not to have belonged to the earliest part of J, but to have been inserted later. *Lods* thinks that in this particular case we have a direct Assyro-Babylonian influence from the time of Manasseh (op. cit., pp. 309 f.). But even the fact mentioned on p. 310, that these traditions seem to be known, already before the 8th century, all over Syria, seems to point to a Canaanite "intermédiaire" also in this case. *Lods* mentions that the Phoenicians sometimes place small "Noah's Arks" in their tombs (cf. the pictures in the much later Christian Catacombs!); and he points to the temple in Hierapolis where the hole in the earth was shown through which the waters had retreated.

Page 28, line 5 from bottom: cf. App. to p. 61, l. 24.

Page 43. Concerning the *Love of God towards Israel* it must be noted that the



roots of this conception of course is to be found in earlier ideas, describing the relations between God and the world and nations under the "metaphor" of *matrimony* as seen in ancient hieròs gámos rites (cf. *N. A. Dahl*, in *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk* I, s. v. *kärlek* (col. 1288); further, *Nyberg*, *Hoseaboken*, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1941, 7, 2, pp. 26ff.). This is the background of texts like Judg. 5, 31; Is. 5, 1-7. The description of Abraham as "the Friend of God" (Is. 41, 8), cf. also the idea of Abraham as the confident servant of God (Gen. 18, 17ff., *Nyberg*, *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk* I, col. 10) probably points back to the idea of the Patriarch as God's "confederate". But the truth of the opinion of the earlier generation of critics of the late 19th century (cf. *S. R. Driver's* commentary) is, that this idea of God's Love towards Israel and Israel's duty to love God in its Israelite form has been especially stressed by Hosea and the Deuteronomists, so it can be regarded as a characteristic feature in Deuteronomistic ideology and phraseology.

*Page 46, note 2:* On the work of the highly original Czech Theologian *Danek*, see *M. Bič*, in *Archiv Orientální*, XIX (1951), pp. 237ff., cf. *Vetus Testamentum* (1951), pp. 157f.

*Page 48, note 1:* In his latest work, *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel* (1952), *Gustav Hölscher* will prove the Southern origin of E (pp. 179ff.). It is no doubt right that J contains Northern traditions and E Southern elements. But in both collections this may only mean that they have both been influenced by common Israelite tradition, by the "gross-israelitische Tradition". I think that *Hölscher* unduly minimizes the factors pointing to the Northern origin of E (see *Hölscher*, p. 179f.): What here is said of the Northern traces in J might as well be said of the connections with Beersaba in E. The connection of the Patriarchs with Southern sanctuaries have been a common presupposition for both strata. The arguments from the books outside the Hexateuch are more problematic, as is the continuation of JE outside the Book of Joshua. We must also remember that all strata have been worked over by Jerusalemite hands (cf. *Lods*, *Histoire*, pp. 178ff and *Budde*, *Gesch. d. althebr. Lit.*, pp. 61f.).

*Page 55, note 2:* *Rowley's* article on Moses and the Decalogue has also been published in French, in *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 1952, pp. 7ff. – On earlier literature consult *L. Koehler*, *Der Dekalog*. *Theol. Rundschau* 1929, pp. 161ff. – See also *Lods*, *Histoire de la litt. hébr.*, pp. 313 and 335ff. *Lods* thinks that the Decalogue belongs to prophetic material and has been inserted in E in the prophetic period. But he admits that the 10th commandment can be understood on the basis of more "primitive" ideas of covetousness (op. cit., pp. 340f.). He also admits that the prohibition of images and the commandment to keep the Sabbath are not of prophetic origin. We should add that *rest-days* are also found among nomadic peoples, and – what is more important – Israel also possessed cattle which had to be fed and watered and milked after the immigration (cf. my *Den israelitiske Sabbat* (1923), pp. 37ff. and the references given there). More difficult I consider the proof drawn from the prohibition of *images*, but the arguments collected by *Rowley* (Moses and the Decalogue, pp. 102ff.) show that the difficulty is not insurmountable. – But we cannot get farther than to the *possibility* of a Mosaic origin. I do not see



that we can demonstrate *probability*. Literarily, the Decalogue must be connected with ritual temple-rules, as *Mowinkel* has shown.

Page 56, note 1. Conc. the date of *The Book of the Covenant*, see *Lods*, Hist. de la litt. hébr., pp. 215–218.

Page 61, l. 24: It has been said, concerning the “constants”, that this criterium should be completely “exclusive”, so that no “isoglosses” occurring in one of the documents can appear in the other. I consider this argument completely “dogmatic”. Take as example the classical “constant” of the *Divine Names*. We have a text – in Ex. 6 – proving the existence of the idea that the godhead had been known in different periods under different names. This corresponds to some parts of Genesis, but not to others. This “constant” is practically “exclusive”. But it cannot be of any relevance against it that, at the fringes between the traditions combined, some “infection” from the nearest context set in (cf. Vol. II, pp. 28 ff. and 90) and caused a use of a Divine Name, at the endings and beginnings of sections, which did not correspond to the main part of the fragments combined (against *H. Heilesen*, in *Salmonsens Leksikon – Tidsskrift* 1952, fasc. 1). I cannot deny myself a repetition of *Pfeiffer*’s challenging words, quoted vol. II, p. 28, “The clue discovered by *Astruc* is not only obvious but given in plain language in Ex. 6,2–5 (although he did not notice it there)”. This cannot be answered by reference to *Dahse*’s arguments from the LXX, for they have been crushed by *Skinner*, nor by assertions concerning “stylistic devices” (*Kapelrud*), for these assertions run contrary to real stylistic characteristics of the stories, nor by *a priori* theories of the exclusiveness of “isoglosses”. – In this connection I should like to underline that also *Engnell* (*Gamla Testamentet*, pp. 198f) does not consider the change of the different divine names arbitrary. He only thinks that it is the “traditionist”, not his material, that changes the names.

Page 88–89. Concerning the combination of the *Pentateuchal strata with continuations in Jos.-Kings* I ought to underline that e.g. *Lods* (Hist. de la litt. hébr., p. 119) does not think that the “sources” outside the Hexateuch, called “J” and “E”, come from the same hands as the stories of J and E in the Hexateuch. He describes them as belonging to the same “milieu”, the same “school”. This agrees rather much with my remarks in the text, and the difference between us is perhaps more a question of degrees in certainty.

Pag. 92, note 8: See now also *Hölscher*, *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel* (Lund 1952), pp. 94f., and *Lods*, *Histoire de la litt. hébr.*, p. 167.

Page 94, line 4ff., cf. *Lods*, Hist. de la litt. hébr., p. 173, cf. *Hölscher*, *Geschichtsschreibung*, pp. 133 f.

Page 95, line 13f.: On the expression "*theocratic*" used especially of the later ("E") stratum in Sam., see *Lods*, Hist. de la litt. hébr., p. 319f. This expression must not be understood as signifying a modern struggle between Church and State, between a conception of divine power and a power resting with the people. "Toute l'antiquité israélite est unanime à penser que Yahvé est souverain suprême d'Israël, qu'Israël est une *théocratie*; il s'agit seulement de savoir par quel organe Dieu gouverne".—

That Jer. has known the antiroyalistic stratum cannot be proved by reference to Jer. 15,1 which doubtless can be explained not only on the basis of this stratum, but on the tradition known from Ps. 99 (against *Lods*, op. cit., p. 322).

Page 113. Concerning my very brief remarks on *The Servant of the Lord* I have — in the notes — referred to *North's* discussion in *The Scottish Journal of Theology* 1950, pp. 374–379. *North* here quotes my explanation from my (Danish) article in *Illustreret Religionsleksikon*. To this I have only to add my appreciation of *North's* rendering and clear representation. — Concerning the "autobiographical" element in my theory I should like to add a few remarks, starting from *North's* arguments against it (cf. his recent volume, *Isaiah 40–55* (1952), p. 32): I do not understand it so that Is. 53 must be considered an "obituary" by the prophet himself, nor do I accept the theory that Is. 53 belongs to Trito-Isaiah. In my commentary on the chapter I have attempted to understand it as a "*prophecy*", a "prediction" in which the prophet visualizes his own death as a "real", not a "ritual" death, and I still think that this conception can be upheld. When *North* says, "It is one thing to say that the portrait of the Servant contains features of the Prophet, *as it undoubtedly does* (Italics mine); it is quite another to say that the Prophet intended the songs as a self-portrait" — then I admit that I think that the Prophet has intended a self-portrait in the same manner as Jesus "intended a self-portrait" in his prophetic words on his passion. He had seen the task set by God for his Messiah, and he was willing to fulfil that task in his own times. And I cannot see that this is an impossible conception. He has not considered himself the Divine "Son of Man". But he was ready to suffer for the salvation of his people — like Moses both in the Elohist and Deuteronomistic traditions, and like Paul (Rom. 9,3).

That the death of the Prophet is a future event cannot be denied by reference to the verbal forms — perfect and imperf. consec. till 53,9 incl., then common imperf. (so *Mowinkel*, in the Norwegian annotated translation, p. 247). For all the forms are to be understood "inside the prophecy". The *praeterita* are only used to distinguish between the first part of his life — the suffer-



ings – as it stands before the prophet in his vision – and the later part, his coming glory. This follows from the character of 53 as a funeral dirge which is placed in the mouth of *future* spectators. *The whole poem is placed in the future.* But inside this future the verbal forms distinguish between earlier and later parts, between “*futurum exactum*” and final “*futurum*”.

This, connected with the fact, admitted by North and underlined above by me, that there are undoubtedly features of the prophet in the picture, leads to the conclusion that the prophet has considered the fate of his “Messiah” his own presumable fate. This is the way in which I venture to uphold the “autobiographical theory”. “Autobiographical” is, however, no good word in this connection, as the songs are understood as dealing to a great extent with the future of the Servant.

They are all expressions of the sentiments found in the Psalms of Lamentation in the sections characterized as expressions of “confidence that the prayer has been granted”. They are confessions of faith and hope, not “autobiography”.

The poem of Is. 53 describes *future* in the vision of the prophet. He makes it his own future. But his passion and death are described as belonging to the past by the spectators who in future will look back, with astonishment, penitence, and awe, to the events which the prophet had foreseen. –

Of quite another type is the very interesting and stimulating book of Lindblom, *The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah* (Lunds Univ. Årsskrift, N.F. Avd. 1, Bd. 47, nr. 5–1951). Lindblom defends the thesis that the Ebed-Yahweh Songs are all *allegorical* or symbolical pictures, intended to depict Israel's situation in the captivity and Israel's God-given task in relation to the pagan world. Each of the first three Songs is followed by an interpretation or rather application. In the last song the description of reality comes first; and then follows the symbolic narrative, the object of which is to make the obscure reality clear and obvious to understanding and emotion. – What the four songs have in common is not the figure described, but they all are allegorical narratives composed with one and the same intention, namely to elucidate one and the same reality. “The decisive question is no longer: *Who* is the Ebed Yahweh in these Songs but: What are the historical facts which are to be elucidated by the symbols employed?” (cf. Lindblom's own *résumé* pp. 50f.).

My objection to this theory is directed against the distinction made in the questions just quoted from Lindblom's book. I have the impression that the solution is not to be found in an “either – or”, but in a “both – and”. And I should think – as a first remark only, for space will not allow a lengthy discussion of all the many details in the book, from which we can learn very



much – that I should end by combining Lindblom's and my own theory: The prophet is describing both his people's task and his own. For he "is" his people – as Christ "is" the Church. – Cf. also the important essay of *Rowley*, *The Suffering Servant of the Lord in the Light of three Decades of Criticism* (in *The Suffering Servant of the Lord and other Essays on the Old Testament* (1952), pp. 3 ff.), discussing the vast literature and giving an attempt at a solution which pays due attention both to "collective" and "individual" features in the description of an individual who will supremely fulfil the mission of Israel. – I can of course to a certain degree accept the argument of *Rowley* against the autobiographical theory that "to suppose that the prophet cherished the confidence that he himself was destined to achieve this mission, yet died without – even beginning it, is to ascribe these glorious songs to empty egotism... The writer is filled with the sense of the glory of God and not of his own greatness". But indeed only to a certain degree I can accept this. For the Servant is filled – also – with a sense of the great task which God has given him. The Song 49, 1–6 speaks – in "autobiographical" form, of his promotion to a greater task, and 52, 13–53, 12 describes his coming exaltation. He is filled with a sense of the glory which God will give him when he has fulfilled his task. And further, it cannot be said that on this theory he died without even beginning his mission – for all his words preserved in Is. 40–55 are the beginning of this task. And that the prophet should only be able to conceive the idea that a *future*, not a *present* individual should accomplish Israel's mission I cannot admit. He can very well have thought of his own future without more egotism than people generally possess when they devote their lives to a great work. That the prophet died before he could say a "consummatum est", is not his fault. It was not disposed that he should do that. He should only point to Him that came in the Fullness of Time: That is what we can see afterwards if we believe in Jesus the Christ.

The stronger words by which *Rowley* (op. cit. p. 12, cf. his reference to *A. S. Peake*, *The Servant of Yahwe*, p. 44) opposes the "autobiographical" theory, I cannot at all accept as an argument against the theory. *Peake* says: "The language in which the Servant speaks would imply far too extravagant an egotism for us lightly to charge the prophet with it." *Rowley* reinforces his words: "...he (the prophet) was only a misguided, self-opinionated dreamer, and not in any sense a mouthpiece of God". – I consider those arguments highly subjective and speculative – both concerning the motives and the thinking of the prophet, and still more concerning our own knowledge of the plans of God. He who according to Church Theology fulfilled the prophecy – and who, according to the faith of the Church, was truly a man

with human limitations – had the same ideas of himself, founded upon the Isaianic texts. Was he – then – “a misguided, self-opinionated dreamer, and not in any sense the mouthpiece of God”? Of course, accepting the orthodox Christology, without modern “kenotic” ideas, the difference can be underlined. But with our kenotic ideas we cannot deny that the Servant of Is. 53 and the One who fulfilled the prophecy, as antitype to the type, must have had to live in their vocation as much “by faith”, and not “by sight”.

The prophet need not be “self-opinionated” because he believed that his call (49,1–6) had to be fulfilled in the extraordinary manner of the prophecy of 53. He has seen that the salvation of his people and the world should be effected through “vicarious suffering”; and he has been ready to take this heavy task upon him. What he has not seen, and what he could not be expected to see, was that the salvation of the world was not to come in his time. Like all other prophets he believed that the final judgment and salvation should take place in his time. A person who – even if he makes a mistake – devotes himself to a great task in the service of God, I cannot call “self-opinionated”. I can understand that some people would say that he was “misguided”. So probably the unbelieving Jews of his time would speak, just as did the scoffers at the cross on Golgatha. But this “misguidance” is *the* problem of *all* prophecy. All prophets have exhibited a hope containing elements which were not fulfilled. Even primitive Christianity felt this problem of the contradiction between the promise of a speedy redemption and the world of facts where it appeared as if God “is slack concerning his promise” (2 Peter 3,9). In this respect Deutero-Isaiah experienced – or his disciples experienced – the same problems as those to whom the fulfilment of the promises had come. That he was “misguided” in so far as he expected the fulfilment of his task immediately, is a consequence of a peculiarity in the vision of all prophets; and ultimately, the solution is a problem which cannot be solved scientifically, but only by faith. We can say that the entire last Ebed Yahwe Song is directed against those who would say that he was “misguided”, because they saw that he would die before his work had been completed. Even therefore he grasps the belief in his own resurrection and in his rich posterity. He is here, himself, wrestling with the problem of apparent “misguidance”. But his faith overcomes his doubts.

*Page 113, line 20 (cf. note 2):* In the list of probably un-Isaianic passages, on p. VII of my commentary on Is. I, a note on 14, 4b–23 has been omitted by mistake. Read 14,4b–23: ca. 550.

Cf. also the “tableau chronologique de l’oeuvre du prophète Ésaïe” in *Lods, Hist. de la litt. hébr.*, p. 277.



Page 115, line 12: add: C. R. North, Isaiah 40-55 (1952); Edw. J. Young, on the Ras Shamra texts and the Servant Songs, in Westminster Theol. Journal 1950, pp. 19ff.

Page 148, line 21: Micah 4,10b is perhaps not from the Assyrian period (*Lods*, Hist. de la litt. hébr., p. 290).

Page 123, notes 4-5. Some of the most impressive pages in *Lods's* Histoire de la litt. hébr. are his paragraphs on the personality of Ezekiel. Especially in connection with *Klostermann's* theory of the *cataleptic fits* of the prophet (pp. 435ff.) the description of *Lods* gives the reader a strong feeling of the uncanny impression this ecstatic must have made on his audience. During his dumb periods he seems to have taken recourse to the "symbolical acts". The speechless ecstatic, performing strange things before the eyes of his simple countrymen who were looking on in a mood mixed of curiosity and awe, must have had a terrifying influence on them. They must have been oppressed with presentiments of coming disasters. "Les silences du prophète devaient faire comprendre à la maison d'Israël qu'elle n'était pas digne d'entendre la parole de son Dieu, qu'elle était une maison de rebelles (3,26). - Les périodes d'immobilité devaient figurer la durée du châtement d'Israël et de Juda (4,4-6). Ainsi Ézéchiél souffrait à cause des péchés de son peuple. C'est surtout pendant des périodes d'aphonie qu'il avait recours aux oracles par geste." - *Lods* rightly points to the overwhelming influence the prophet must have exercised over two great poets like *Schiller* and *Victor Hugo* (p. 441) and says, "Il y'a dans le livre d'Ézéchiél des pages dont la puissance, la hardiesse, la richesse des coloris rappellent le romantisme plus que la sobriété classique d'un Ésaïe". - On the other hand, *Lods* declares that this great personality is not easily discovered because of both the deplorable state of the text of the book and of the peculiar, somewhat artificial style of the prophet. The book presents a curious mixture of powerful, sometimes baroque et bizarre poetry and, on the other hand, a pedantic striving to get every detail into his descriptions - but with the result that the descriptions become highly obscure. - It is this mixture which leads me to infer that in principle the criticism of *Hölscher* was right: Most of the book is an analogy to the "deuteronomic" prose sermons in the book of Jeremiah and in the present form comes from his pupils. But I am ready to admit the possibility that both prophets may sometimes have used the prosaic parenetic language of their priestly colleagues in the deuteronomic and Zadokite circles.

Page 130, note 2. On the home of the prophet *Hosea* cf. also *Lods*, Hist. de la litt. hébr., p. 242, against *Ewald*, who in order to explain why the book of a Northern prophet was incorporated in the Jewish canon assumed that *Hosea* had concluded his work in Judah. *Lods* admits the probability if *Hosea* was still alive after 722, but not the necessity of the idea. He assumes after the fall of the Northern kingdom a situation parallel to that following the fall of Constantinople in 1453, when Greek scholars emigrated to the West and brought Greek books and manuscripts with them.

Page 162. After Malachi, or on p. 129, readers rightly might have expected a list of commentaries on the entire book of the "Minor Prophets". Such are found in the current series. Outside the series I should point to *Wellhausen*, Die kleinen Propheten, 3rd. ed. 1898. - *E. B. Pusey's* The Minor Prophets has been re-issued in 1950 (2 vols) in America. It is one of the monuments of



19th century repristination-theology (cf. the review by M. G. Kilne, in *The Westminster Theol. Journal*, XIV, 2 (1952), pp. 182f.). The first ed. appeared in 1861-65.

Page 167, on the dating of Psalms, cf. Appendix to Vol. I, p. 117, line 6.

Page 169, on *The Technical Terms*. In vol. I, p. 167 some remarks have been made on the expression *l'dawid* which may perhaps be carried a little further. It has been noted that probably this expression has a pre-history in Semitic royal titles as seen in the *Mari-texts*. This would mean that the word originally—at least earlier — meant “for the chief”, to be used in the ritual of and by the chief. —

A similar meaning may be supposed in the case of the much discussed rubric *lamm<sup>e</sup>našše<sup>a</sup>h*, mostly rendered “To the Chief Musician”. Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien* IV, pp. 17ff. (cf. Offersang og Sangoffer, pp. 497f.) rejects this translation. His positive, tentative explanation is that the word, grammatically, is a *nomen actionis*, signifying the ritual act of “making Yahweh’s face shine”, i. e. to avert his anger and invoke his grace. This is the understanding of the Aramaic Targum. But M. has also pointed out that the root *nšh* seems to mean “to be the leader” (of cultic works—so in Chronicles). The notion of *leadership* seems, however, to connect the word with *l'dawid* in the supposed earlier meaning. In this connection it is also significant that this meaning is perhaps presupposed by other of the ancient translations, *Aquila*, *Theodotion*, *Symmachus*, and *Jerome* (cf. my *Det sakrale kongedømme*, p. 108, n. 1), all translating the word by nouns referring to a “victor” and “victory”. This indicates that *l'dawid* and *lamm<sup>e</sup>našše<sup>a</sup>h* are synonyms, alluding to at “the Leader” of the community, the chief, the king. “The Chief Musician” may be understood by means of 2 Sam. 6 where the priest-king leads the choir of his followers in the ecstatic dancing and singing (cf. Ps. 42, 5?). That both words in some cases are used in the same verse need not disturb this assumption. The superscriptions, as they stand now, do not give evidence for the knowledge of their original significance on the part of the collectors, and the state of the tradition in MT and the Versions proves that it is confused.

On the other terms the reader is referred to the treatment in Mowinckel’s op. cit. which in spite of its hypothetical character expressly underlined in the preface to Ps. St. IV ought to be mentioned in a modern Hebrew dictionary.

Page 181, note 2. The *dramatic theory* on *The Song of Songs* which was defended by Renan is renewed by Guittou, *Le Cant. des Cantiques* (1934 – 2 ed. 1948) and by Waterman in 1948 in the book mentioned p. 182 in the note on Commentaries. Against

this theory which includes an historical interpretation of the drama as polemical against Solomon and as an expression of Northern Israelite animosity after the disruption of the Davidic kingdom – see Rowley's article on The Interpretation of the Song of Songs, in *The Servant of the Lord and other Essays* (1952), p. 219, n. 1. Similarly, A. Robert, *Le Cantique des Cantiques* (1951) advocates an historical allegory: Yahwe calls his bride, Israel, to return from the exile in Babylon. The Song becomes a parallel to Deutero-Isaiah. I think that this may be a later re-interpretation, not the primitive, literal meaning. The many parallels from the rest of the OT in my eyes look more like disintegrated members of the Song. I hope to return to the matter in another connection.

Page 198, note 2. On the theory of world periods, see also the articles of Baumgartner in *Theol. Zeitschrift Basel* 1945, pp. 17 ff. and in *Symbolae Hrozný III*, p. 104, n. 164, cf. Ginsberg, *Studies in Daniel*, pp. 5 ff., and my commentary (1952), p. 29.

Page 182, line 3: Note here Rowley's interpretation of the "Shulammite" (cf. *Am. Journ. of Sem. Lang.* 1939, pp. 84 ff.), as a feminine formation of Solomon, "the Solomones" – a view adopted by many scholars (see Rowley's list (cf. *J.S.L.*, pp. 84–88), to which he now adds H. S. Nyberg, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 1938, pp. 354 f.); cf. also Rowley, *op. cit.* p. 223.

Page 182. On the religious value of the *Song of Songs* as a Canonical Book, see also Rowley, in *The Servant of the Lord etc.*, pp. 232–34.

Page 211, in the § on literature to Ezra-Nehemiah I have forgotten to quote the book of Kapelrud (cf. Vol. I, p. 22, note 5). – In the very useful *Compléments Bibliographiques in Lods, Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive*, p. 1039 I have been credited with this work, and Copenhagen mentioned as its place of publication instead of Oslo.

Page 234, line 30 ff. The description of the contents of *The Wisdom of Solomon* is given according to the usual interpretation. – On reading the book again I was struck by the many resemblances to the Hymns of the Ascension (New Year Festival) and the Royal Psalms. The arrangement of Solomon's teaching, as given in the book, is from the beginning modelled upon the warnings of the *Second Psalm*. The speech is directed to the "Rulers of the Earth" (cf. Ps. 2, 10, and especially its parallel in *Wisd.* 6, 1). – The prayer in ch. 9 is a variation of the theme of Ps. 72, which is a prayer for the king that he may be wise and able to rule God's people. In *Wisd.* the prayer is concluded by a confession of the king's need: Without divine wisdom he cannot fulfil his task. This is a hymn in praise of Wisdom which is continued in the rest of the book, describing the works of Wisdom in the history of Israel. These chapters are, formally, a parallel to Pss. 78 and 104–106. – The teaching is, accordingly, a warning to the "rulers of the earth" by the king of Israel, that they turn from unrighteousness to the wisdom of Israel's God. This warning the king enforces

by describing his own prayer that God will give him wisdom. In this variation of 1 Kings 3 he proclaims and exalts the works of Wisdom as revealed in the history from Creation to the liberation of Israel from Egypt. Also this historical background is evidence for the influence of the Israelite New Year Festival on the book. The same is the case with the description of the imminent judgment (the eschatology of the book), in ch. 5.

I hope, in another connection, to return to this subject and give a more detailed proof of my thesis. – I should perhaps add that I see no need to arrange chs. 10ff as “prose” over against the first 9 chapters, as done e.g. in the new Danish translation of the Apocrypha. There are numerous examples of *parallelismus membrorum* in 10ff. And the form of prayer is continued by direct apostrophes of God (11,1 ff.; 14,3).

All this seems to be of importance for the determination of the *literary type* of Wisd. Its aim is either to induce non-Jewish readers to *adopt the Jewish religion*, or – as said vol. II, p. 236 – to *win back apostate Jews*. It is a piece of *missionary-literature*, both for home and foreign use.

But this teaching is in reality given as a sort of *Midrash on the situation of Solomon in 1 Kings 3,5ff*. In this respect the book gives an example of the way in which later Jewish legend sometimes developed on the basis of situations in canonical texts.

Page 251, line 6ff. *Lods* also includes Apocalypses of *Elijah*, *Zephaniah*, *Pseudepigrapha* under the names of *Greek Philosophers* and works now lost, as *Pseudo-Aristobulus*.

Theology Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT  
California

94158



## INDEX TO THE APPENDIX

Akiba.....	16	Hirsch, S. A.....	8
Albright.....	2, 6 f.	Hobbes .....	19
Anderson, G. W.....	13, 14	van Hoonacker.....	17
Astruc.....	22	Hölscher....	8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 21, 22, 27
Atumano, Simon.....	1	Hugo, Victor .....	27
Audet.....	2	Ibn Ezra.....	19
Baumgartner.....	2, 9	Irwin, W. A.....	1
Bea.....	15, 16	Jacobsen, Johannes.....	19
Bič.....	21	Josephus.....	16
Birkeland.....	18	Kahle, P. ....	2, 3, 6
Boschwitz.....	19	Kapelrud.....	15, 17, 22, 29
Bowman, R. A.....	13	Kilne.....	28
Brownlee.....	2, 8 9	Klima.....	11
Budde.....	20	Kochler, L.....	21
Burkitt.....	1	Lacheman.....	2
Burrows, Millar.....	2, 3	Lietzmann.....	10
Bæksted.....	9	Lindblom.....	3, 5, 14, 24
Cazelles, H.....	2	Lods... 1. 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 18, 19,	
Coppens.....	3, 16, 17	20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 30	
Dahl, N. A.....	21	Mowinckel.....	3, 6, 9, 21, 28
Dahse.....	15, 22	Müller, D. H. ....	11
Danek.....	21	Nielsen, Ed.....	8
Deissmann.....	10	Nielsen, S. Holm.....	18
Dieterich.....	8	North.....	13-16, 23, 24, 27
Diringer.....	2	Noth, M.....	1, 13, 18
Dornseiff.....	9	Nyberg, H. S.....	20, 21, 28
Driver, G. R.....	2, 3, 8	Nöldcke.....	6
Driver, S. R.....	20, 21	Parrot .....	1, 3, 4, 11
Dupont-Sommer, A.....	3, 4, 5, 10	Pap, L.....	5
Eissfeldt.....	2, 9	Pauly-Wissowa.....	16
Engnell.....	13-15, 17, 18, 20	Peake .....	25
Ewald.....	27	Pedersen, Johs.....	14, 16, 18
Février.....	2, 5, 9	de la Peyrère.....	19
Frederick II.....	1	Pfeiffer, R. H.....	1, 20, 22
Galling.....	17	Pico della Mirandola.....	1
Guitton.....	28	v. de Ploeg.....	6
Graf.....	1	Price, I. M.....	2
Hammershaimb.....	17, 20	Pusey.....	27
Hegel.....	19	v. Rad.....	13
Heilesen, H.....	22	Raimundus Lullus.....	1
Hempel.....	3		

Renan . . . . .	28	21, 17-19 . . . . .	7
Reuchlin . . . . .	1	21, 27-29 . . . . .	6
Reuss . . . . .	6	Deuteronomy: 4, 2 . . . . .	16
Ringgren . . . . .	17	4, 5 . . . . .	16
Robert . . . . .	28	5, 22 . . . . .	16
Roberts, B. J. . . . .	1, 16	12, 32 . . . . .	16
Rowley, H. H. . . . .	3, 7, 13, 21, 24, 25, 29	Joshua: 10, 12-13 . . . . .	7
Rowley, Margaret . . . . .	3	Judges: 5, 31 . . . . .	21
Sabatier . . . . .	5	Kings: 3, 5 ff. . . . .	29 f.
Schlatter, A. . . . .	16	Isaiah: 5, 1-7 . . . . .	21
Schoeps . . . . .	4, 5, 9	40-55 . . . . .	25
Schrey . . . . .	13	41, 8 . . . . .	21
Skinner . . . . .	15, 16, 22	53 . . . . .	25 ff.
Smalley, B. . . . .	1	Jeremiah: 15, 1 . . . . .	23
Speiser . . . . .	2	Ezekiel: 33, 32 . . . . .	7
Spiro, A. . . . .	5	Micah: 4, 10 . . . . .	26
Stephanus . . . . .	5	Psalms	
Steuernagel . . . . .	5	Technical Terms . . . . .	27 f.
Suhard . . . . .	18	Ps. 2 . . . . .	29
Sukenik . . . . .	2, 8	15 . . . . .	8
Teicher . . . . .	5	42, 5 . . . . .	28
Treuer, J. C. . . . .	2	45 . . . . .	7
Waterman, I. . . . .	7, 28	48 . . . . .	8
de Vaux . . . . .	3, 4	68 . . . . .	6
Vermes, G. . . . .	3	72 . . . . .	29
de Wette . . . . .	19	76 . . . . .	8
Voltaire . . . . .	19	78 . . . . .	29
Vosté . . . . .	18	84 . . . . .	8
Wellhausen . . . . .	1, 13, 19, 20	87 . . . . .	8
Wernberg-Møller . . . . .	18	99 . . . . .	23
Widengren . . . . .	6	104-106 . . . . .	29
Wikgren, A. P. . . . .	2	107 . . . . .	9
Vriezen . . . . .	4, 5, 9	122 . . . . .	8
Wright, G. E. . . . .	13	133 . . . . .	8
Young, E. J. . . . .	27	Song of Songs . . . . .	7, 28 f.
		Wisdom of Solomon . . . . .	29 f.
		Rona: 1, 31 . . . . .	10
		9, 3 . . . . .	23
		Gal: 5, 19-23 . . . . .	10
		Josephus, Antiqu: I 17: 7, VII 38: 7, IV 196:	
		7, IV 304: 7, V 61: 7, VIII 159: 7.	
		Papyrus Nash . . . . .	2, 4
		The Dead Sea Scrolls . . . . .	2 ff.
		Habakkuk-Commentary . . . . .	4, 9 ff.
		Hymns . . . . .	8
		Manual of Discipline . . . . .	4, 9 ff.
		Vetus Latina . . . . .	5 ff.

## TEXTS

Pentateuch: . . . . .	13 ff.
Genesis: 18, 17 ff. . . . .	21
18, 22-23 . . . . .	9
Exodus: . . . . .	
1-15 . . . . .	17
6, 2-5 . . . . .	9
15 . . . . .	7
Num: 6, 24 . . . . .	9
21, 13-17 . . . . .	6